

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 2 1952

VOLUME XLVII

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

NUMBER 2

April 1952

*Desk*

---

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

---

*A Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

---

---

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

RICHARD TREAT BRUÈRE, *Managing Editor*  
 BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER  
 OSCAR BRONEER  
 CARL DARLING BUCK  
 BENEDICT EINARSON  
 FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON  
 JAKOB A. O. LARSEN  
 RICHARD P. MCKEON  
 RALPH MARCUS  
 GERTRUDE SMITH

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FREDERICK MALCOLM COMBELLACK, *University of Oregon*  
 PHILLIP HOWARD DE LACY, *Washington University*  
 AUBREY DILLER, *Indiana University*  
 ROBERT J. GETTY, *University of Toronto*  
 WILLIAM CHASE GREENE, *Harvard University*  
 GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*

VOL. XLVII

CONTENTS FOR APRIL 1952

No. 2

<i>Origines gentium</i> . . . . .	Elias J. Bickerman	65
Adelard, Aristotle, and the <i>De natura deorum</i> . . . . .	Theodore Silverstein	82
Notes and Discussions . . . . .		87
<p>G. M. BOLLING: Genuine Tradition and Late Manuscripts.—JOYCE S. and ARTHUR E. GORDON: Publius Memorialis and <i>CIL</i>, XI, 7554 (= Dessau, 9195).—O. J. TODD: <i>Frutum porcinum</i>.—FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN: Aristotle <i>De caelo</i> A 9. 278 a 28 ff.—W. C. HELMBOLD: Athens and Aegina.—LLOYD W. DALY: Callimachus and Catullus.—BENEDICT EINARSON: Plutarch's Ancestry.—EMIL VETTER: Note on Terence <i>Eunuchus</i> 19–24.</p>		
Book Reviews . . . . .		101
<p>PAUL FRIEDLÄNDER: <i>Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars</i> (Lattimore).—J. MARCZEAT: <i>Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire</i> (Getty).—VIKTOR PÖSCHL: <i>Die Dichtkunst Virgils: Bild und Symbol in der Aeneis</i> (Bruère).—ALOIS WALDE and J. B. HOFMANN: <i>Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> (Whatmough).—KARL SCHEFFOLD: <i>Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker</i> and ERNST BUSCHOR: <i>Das hellenistische Bildnis</i> (Blankenbagen).—J. ANDRÉ: <i>La Vie et l'œuvre d'Asinius Pollion</i> (Bruère).—FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN: <i>Hesiod and Aeschylus</i> (Latta).—A. I. AMATUCCI (ed.): <i>T. Macci Plauti Rudens</i> (Duckworth).—AGNES NEWHALL STILLWELL: <i>The Potters' Quarter</i> (Young).—A. A. CHRISTOPHILOPOULOU: <i>Ἡ Συγκριτικὴ εἰς τὸ Βυζαντινὸν κράτος</i> (Charanis).—ERNST HOWARD: <i>Die Kultur der Antike</i> (McDonald).—ERNESTUS DIEHL (ed.): <i>Anthologia lyrica Graeca</i>, Fasc. 1 and 2 (Walton).—A. Y. CAMPBELL (ed.): <i>Euripides: Helena</i> (Walton).—D. F. W. VAN LENNEP: <i>Euripides: Selected Plays, with Introduction, Metrical Synopsis and Commentary, Part I: The Alkestis</i> (Walton).—A. ERNOUT: <i>Les Adjectifs latins en -ōsus et en -ulentus</i> (Whatmough).—G. REDARD: <i>Les Noms grecs en -της, -τα et principalement en -της, -τα</i>: <i>Étude philologique et linguistique</i> (Whatmough).—KARL SCHEFFOLD: <i>Griechische Plastik, Vol. I: Die grossen Bildhauer des archaischen Athen</i> (Johnson).—ERICH KOESTERMANN (ed.): <i>P. Cornelii Taciti Germania</i> (Robathan).—BRUNO SNELL (ed.): <i>Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis</i> (Wyckoff).—ALPHONSE KURFESS (ed.): <i>Appendix Sallustiana</i>, Fasc. 1 and 2 (De Lacy).—JOSEPH SEVIER CALLAWAY: <i>Sybaris</i> (Roebuck).—VLADIMIR GEORGIEV: <i>Le Décifrement des inscriptions minoennes and Inscriptions minoennes quasi-bilingues</i> (Bennett).—MOSES HADAS: <i>A History of Greek Literature</i> (Blake).</p>		
Books Received . . . . .		135

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of Classical Philology, Box I, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Ave., Chicago 37, Illinois. ¶ Subscriptions are by volume only. The subscription price is \$6.00 per volume; the price of single issues is \$1.75. Orders for service of less than a full volume will be charged at the single issue rate. ¶ Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions. No extra charge for countries in the Pan American Postal Union. ¶ Postage is charged extra as follows: for Canada and Newfoundland, 20 cents per volume (total \$6.20), 5 cents per issue (total \$1.80); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 50 cents per volume (total \$6.50), 10 cents per issue (total \$1.85). ¶ Subscriptions are payable in advance. Please make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following is an authorized agent:

For the British Empire except North America and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Microfilms of this journal are available to regular subscribers only and may be obtained at the end of the volume year. Orders and inquiries should be addressed to University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Notice to subscribers: If you change your address, please notify us and your local postmaster immediately.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.



C

Vo

V

we  
th  
m  
ib  
T  
D  
de  
A  
op  
gl  
le

tv  
g  
d  
se  
o  
t  
f  
t  
f  
d  
c



# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLVII

APRIL 1952

Number 2

## ORIGINES GENTIUM

ELIAS J. BICKERMAN

The beginning of Nations, those excepted of whom sacred Books  
have spok'n, is to this day unknown.

MILTON, *The History of Britain*

WRITING in 7 B.C., Dionysius of Halicarnassus states that at this time the origins of Rome were still unknown to the Greeks. He, then, sets forth the classic story of Romulus and Remus as "the most credible" report of the foundation of Rome. Thus, in the seventh generation, as Dionysius reckons, of Rome's universal dominion, the Greek subjects of Caesar Augustus continued to believe false opinions (as Dionysius says) on the beginnings of the imperial city and neglected the authorised Roman version.<sup>1</sup>

### I

Dionysius is not exaggerating. Some twenty-five Greek accounts of the origins of Rome have come down to us, diligently collected by Dionysius himself, Plutarch, and Latin savants.<sup>2</sup> None of them agrees with the accepted Roman tradition. They are mostly jejune inferences from the name of the city to the person of the supposed founder or foundress: Romus or Roma. The Greeks dispensed with any imaginative effort

respecting the founders of Rome. It would have been a simple matter to make Herakles, whose worship was ancient in Rome, the ancestor of the Romans. But neither he, nor, let us say, Diomedes, whose vestiges are numerous in Greek Apulia, was thought of as the founder of the city.<sup>3</sup> Greek settlers in southern Italy for some reason identified the native populations with Arcadians. By mechanical transfer of the same conception to a northern district, Rome was believed to be a colony of Arcadians led by Evander.<sup>4</sup> The latter name was arbitrarily picked up in a mythological catalogue.<sup>5</sup> In the appendix to Hesiod's *Theogony*, Latinus figures as a son of Odysseus and Circe. Rome being a Latin city, her eponymous hero was regarded by some as descended from Odysseus.<sup>6</sup> In the Hellenistic Age, however, these views gained little acceptance. Some new and eccentric ideas aside,<sup>7</sup> the opinion predominant among the Alexandrian scholars was that Rome had been founded by Aeneas or his descendant, Romus.

The Trojan ancestry of Rome bothered no ancient historian, but it perplexes their modern successors,<sup>8</sup> who are captives of their own theories. Rightly or wrongly they suppose that the legendary wanderings of a mythical hero personify the extension of colonization by his people, the spread of his cult, or some other historical reality. For instance, Greek colonists brought with them Diomedes and Herakles to Italy. Now, the Trojans did not exist in historical times, and there was no Trojan settlement in Italy, or, for that matter, anywhere. Thus, the appearance of Aeneas in Italy is a puzzle.

As a matter of fact, the Trojan ancestry of Rome is no legend floating in the popular memory and passed from mouth to mouth. It is as little a saga as the descent of the Britons from Brute, the great grandson of Aeneas, or from the Lost Tribes of Israel. These are learned conjectures which are bounded by no tribal limitations nor associated with folktales. In exactly the same way no less a man than Hugo Grotius suggested that the North American Indians were Germans (and that those of Yucatan came from Ethiopia, while the Peruvians were of Chinese descent).<sup>9</sup> Aeneas in Italy is no more puzzling than the Amazons in the same country or the traces of Ulysses in Scotland and Germany.<sup>10</sup> About 100 B.C. a Greek school teacher in Spain found out that the Callaeci, a tribe recently (134 B.C.) conquered by the Romans, were descendants of Teucer, a stepbrother of Ajax and the best archer among the Greeks before Troy. This learned hypothesis soon became accepted by Greek scholars as well as by the Spaniards themselves.<sup>11</sup> *Gallaeci autem Graecam sibi originem adserunt*. Rome became a Trojan colony in the same manner.

## II

The first Greek writer, as far as we know, who dealt with the origins of Rome was the mythologist Hellanicus about 430 B.C.<sup>12</sup> He knew the hypothesis which connected Rome with Odysseus,<sup>13</sup> but his own conjecture was that Rome had been founded by Aeneas and named after the Trojan woman who had suggested setting fire to the ships of the wanderers. This feat of the Trojan women, as Strabo complains, was assigned to many places, but was also localized in Latium.<sup>14</sup> In the parallel stories, however, the women are captives of the Achaeans. They burn the ships, fearing the prospect of slavery in Greece. Let us remember Cassandra in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* to understand their act. But in Hellanicus, it becomes senseless because the Trojan women destroy their own ships. The busy historian had no time to spare for such cavil. Rome, a place in the Far West, known from mere hearsay reports, had no distinct meaning for him. He was interested in Aeneas and not in the Romans.

At his time, Aeneas had only begun his wanderings. From the end of the sixth century on, Aeneia (south of Thessalonike) showed the Trojan hero on her coins. Stesichorus let him embark for the "Far West" (*Hesperia*). But his adventures westwards still formed no body of established traditions. He was associated with some tribes in Epirus. In the middle of the fifth century Aeneas was already believed to be the founder of Eryx and Segeste in Sicily. To about the same time belong the four votive terracottas found in Veii. They represent Aeneas carrying Anchises.<sup>15</sup> Hellanicus was the first to trace Aeneas' voyage from Ilion to Italy. He made Rome a station in Aeneas' wanderings. Thereafter, the Trojan Rome became a part of the

Greek reconstruction of the migrations after the fall of Troy.<sup>16</sup> This historical integration has assured the success of the hypothesis. There was, of course, room for learned discussion. Was Roma born in Troy, as, for instance, Agathocles of Cyzicus supposed,<sup>17</sup> or in Italy? A Hellenistic author made Romus a son of Aeneas and Lavinia.<sup>18</sup> Or, perhaps, Romus was not a direct descendant of Aeneas at all but only a poor relation.<sup>19</sup> One could write on the subject in an original manner, disentangling the difficulties in most satisfactory fashion, yet without coming into any conflict with accepted mythology. Aristarchus himself would be unable to disprove a conjecture in this new field of the ancient lore (*archaiologia*). But the decisive reason for the success of Hellanicus' hypothesis was its acceptance by the Romans themselves.

### III

The tale of Romulus and Remus is indigenous and ancient. The she-wolf in the Palazzo dei Conservatori on the Capitol was cast in the early sixth century. The sucking infants are, of course, a Renaissance addition, but, according to the archeologists, the posture of the animal justifies the restoration.<sup>20</sup> In any case, in 296 B.C., Q. Ogulnius placed "the likeness of the twins who founded the city under the udders of the she-wolf." The first Roman silver coins, bearing the legend *Romano*, show her suckling the twins.<sup>21</sup> Like many Greek issues (e.g., Taras riding on his dolphin on the coins of Tarentum), the Roman didrachms proclaimed the foundation story of the city *urbi et orbi*.<sup>22</sup>

In the meantime, at an early date (which it is impossible to fix precisely) the belief in the Trojan parentage of the city became an article of the Roman

national creed. The early Roman writers, Naevius, Fabius Pictor, Cato, fully recognized this ancestry. Naevius, who wrote a play *Alimoniae Remi et Romuli*, in his historical poem described Aeneas' departure from Troy, his landing on the Latin coast and his alliance with the natives. Romulus was for him a son of Aeneas' daughter. Therefore, the weight of Roman opinion supported the Trojan hypothesis in the eyes of the Greeks. But although Roman historians, writing in Greek, such as Fabius Pictor and L. Cincius Alimentus, put the Roman saga, combined with the Trojan version, before the Greek reading public, Greek authors either disregarded the Roman account or altered it *ad libitum*.<sup>23</sup>

Callias who wrote about 290 B.C. is probably the first Greek writer who took cognizance of the Roman saga. But for him Romus, Romulus and Telegonus are sons of Latinus, offspring of Telemachus and Circe, and Roma, daughter of Aeneas and the Trojan woman Roma.<sup>24</sup> Another author makes Romus, the builder of the eternal city, a grandson of Romulus and great-grandson of Aeneas.<sup>25</sup> Hegesianax visited Rome in 193 B.C. as an envoy of Antiochus III. Nevertheless, he makes Romus, a son of Aeneas, the founder of Rome and also lets him, together with his brother Romulus, build Capua.<sup>26</sup> Polybius himself, being Arcadian, preferred to regard Rome as an Arcadian colony. He must have known from Cato's *Origines* that Lavinia was Aeneas' wife. This was a capital piece in the Roman reconstruction of the national past. Yet, Polybius made her a concubine of Herakles.<sup>27</sup>

Nevertheless, the Greeks of the third and second century B.C. were neither ignorant of Rome nor of her primeval history. The city and Gaius, a heroic Roman, figure in Callimachus' *Aetia*.

Perhaps from 263 B.C. on, the Roman descent from Troy was used as a propaganda motive in international politics. At the same time when Flaminius called himself "Aeneades," Aristophanes of Byzantium rejected as interpolated the verses in the *Iliad* which announce the future glory of Aeneas' progeny.<sup>28</sup>

In fact, when the Greeks really wanted to do so, they were able to reproduce the Roman version accurately. Lycophron, parading his knowledge of abstruse lore, let Cassandra speak of a "pair of lion whelps" who will found a new Troy. About 160 B.C., in the temple of Apollonia (the mother of Eumenes II and Attalus III) at Cyzicus, a relief represented Romulus and Remus among other examples of motherly love. But these were exceptions, and their originators no historians. Greek historiography continued to keep aloof from the Roman tradition of the beginning of the eternal city.<sup>29</sup>

#### IV

Dionysius wanted to explain Greek ignorance of "the earlier Roman history" by anti-Roman prejudice.<sup>30</sup> The suggestion is significant for the history of Greek opposition to Rome, but as the explanation of Greek disregard for Roman traditions, it does not carry conviction. As a matter of fact, a century after Dionysius, Flavius Josephus no less bitterly complains that the Greek authors misrepresent the primitive history of another chosen people because they have not read the Bible. Again, like Dionysius, he explains this negligence by the malignity of the detractors.<sup>31</sup> Again, the evidence confirms the correctness of his statements as well as the unfairness of his explanation. The authentic history of Israel could have become known to the Greeks in the

Septuagint, about the middle of the third century B.C. From Demetrius, who wrote about 220 B.C., until Josephus himself who published his *Archaiologia* in A.D. 93-94, Jewish historians labored to make their past palatable to Greek taste, by shortening, adapting and paraphrasing the scriptural account. Their work was of no avail. Tacitus, contemporary with Josephus, in order to "reveal the origins" of Jerusalem quotes six different theories. Some of them are quite flattering to the Jews (from the Greek point of view), as for instance the identification of the founders of Jerusalem with Homer's Solymi.<sup>32</sup> But no Greek version agrees with the Bible. Yet, Moses was rather favored. In contradistinction to Romulus, he was regarded from the beginning as the founder of his people.<sup>33</sup>

The plain fact is that any barbarian people might have raised the same complaint as the champions of Jerusalem and of Rome. Herodotus who so readily admits the great and marvellous deeds of the barbarians, balks at accepting the indigenous accounts respecting the beginnings of a people. The Caunians say they are immigrants from Crete, but Herodotus regards them as autochthonous. The Carians adduce weighty evidence for their claim to be autochthonous. Herodotus, agreeing with the Cretan version, holds them to be Leleges and immigrants from the Aegean Islands. Sicanians say they are indigenous in Sicily, "but as the truth is found to be," for Thucydides they are Iberians who were driven by the Ligurians from Spain.<sup>34</sup> The Greeks connected the Persians with Perseus, son of Danae. Having learned of Achaemenes, the eponymous ancestor of the Persian kings, they simply made him an offspring of Perseus.<sup>35</sup> In 279, the Galatians burst upon Greece and Asia Minor

and wrought destruction on Hellenes. The best Greek scholars, Timaeus and Callimachus, immediately discover the origin of these wild hordes. The Galatians obviously descended from Galatea and Polyphemus. A pity that they resembled the one-eyed monster rather than the tender nymph. Some 160 years later, the invasion of the Cimbri attracts the attention of Greek scholars to this unknown race. Various conjectures are proposed: the Cimbri are Celto-Scythians, a mixed people. They are, perhaps, identical with Homer's Cimmerians. As Posidonius wisely observed, a tribe of roaming brigands could have appeared on the Sea of Azov in Homer's time and pop up in 113 B.C. in France.<sup>36</sup> Asclepiades of Myrleia lived among the Turdetani, "the wisest of the Iberians," who had prose and poetic written records of their ancient past as well as laws written in verses. He wrote a "description" of the people. He disregarded the native tradition, and discovered Odysseus' tracks and relics in Spain.<sup>37</sup> Nothing can be more significant in this respect than the Etruscan question. From Herodotus on (who had referred to his Lydian informants) Greek and Latin authors endlessly repeated the hypothesis that the Etruscans came from Lydia. Others regarded them as "Pelasgians," but not even Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who claimed they were autochthonous, found it necessary to question the Etruscans themselves. Yet, in A.D. 26 the city of Sardis, on a political occasion, quoted an Etruscan decree (authentic or not) which spoke of kinship between the two peoples.<sup>38</sup>

Generally speaking, Greek scholars reproduce the native account of the origins of a barbarian people only when they do not know better, and leave the responsibility to the informant. "The Maxyes (in North Africa) say they are

descendants from men who came from Troy." Herodotus' account of Egyptian ancient history, given him by the native scholars, is inserted between two formal statements which relieve Herodotus of responsibility for the narrative.<sup>39</sup>

Of course, Greek scholars more often than not treated domestic traditions with the same freedom. An Athenian clan (the Gephyraioi) claimed Eretrian descent. But Herodotus says, "as I have found out," they came with Cadmus from Phoenicia to Boeotia, and when driven out from that country, settled in Attica.<sup>40</sup> Yet, it is obviously not the same thing for a Greek scholar to re-arrange Greek tradition, discussing for instance whether Zethus and Amphion lived before or after Cadmus,<sup>41</sup> and for Herodotus to judge, as he does, about the origins of the Scythians. Further, while he, as a rule, corrects the domestic saga, he abandons the foreign one as incredible. Hecataeus transforms Cerberus into a deadly serpent. Herodotus accepts the colonization story of Thera and Cyrene as told by Greek settlers. But he simply disregards the story which the Scythians told about their origins. "In my judgment, they tell incredible tales."<sup>42</sup>

Yet, Herodotus, and other Greek authors after him, repeat no less marvellous barbarian stories, as soon as they cease to deal with the origins of the tribe. The story of Tarpeia was retold by two Greek authors, Antigonus and Zenodotus, in substantial agreement with the Roman tradition. But the former asserted that Romus, son of Zeus, was the builder of Rome. The latter invented Praeneste, son of Latinus and grandson of Odysseus, as the founder of the city of the same name, although the local saga named Caeculus, miraculously discovered near the fire, as the ancestor of Praeneste.<sup>43</sup>



## V

Yet, this irksome attitude of Greek scholarship was legitimate and natural. The *archaiologia* was for the Greeks no retelling of sagas or guesswork but a methodical science. Dionysius of Halicarnassus is anxious to establish the Greek parentage of Rome. But having read in Cato and other Latin works that the Italian Aborigines were immigrants from Achaia, he is not at all prepared to accept this support. Instead he says that these Latin historians neither specify the race of Greeks to which the colonists belonged, nor the city from which they migrated, nor the date, nor the leader, nor the cause of the wandering. Moreover, although dealing with a Greek event, they quote "no writer on Greek history as their authority." Josephus again agrees with Dionysius as to methodical principles. The subject of his *archaiologia*, he says, is to show who were the Jews, how they withdrew from the Egyptians, which territory they then occupied and the events which followed the settlement. There are few modern writers on the wandering of Indo-Europeans, Nordics, etc. who would satisfy the methodical standard of Greek scholarship. Dionysius takes the view that the origins of the Aborigines are uncertain. But if they were of Hellenic extraction, they could have been only a colony of "those who are now called Arcadians." A brilliant piece of historical investigation follows. According to historical probabilities, the Aborigines could have been led from Arcadia to Italy by Oenotrus, seventeen generations before the Trojan war.<sup>44</sup>

Dionysius, alas, applies his excellent historical method in vain. The evidence which he collects and examines are tales of mythologists. As Eratosthenes had said, before the first Olympiad

(776 B.C.), came the "mythical" epoch of Greece.<sup>45</sup> The Greeks had no other material for the reconstitution of their first age. This is the reason why, from Hecataeus on, Greek historians applied themselves to turning the mythological figures and fabulous happenings of their sagas into historical persons and events. Herakles chasing the oxen of Geryon was converted into a general at the head of an international army.<sup>46</sup> This work transformed a fictitious past into historical reality which for the Greeks formed the more or less vague background of subsequent events. By this rationalizing interpretation, Greek scholarship created for the Greeks a scientific pre-history which no other people of the ancient world possessed. Elsewhere, no limits marked the boundary between history and fable. Speaking of the Amazons, Strabo stresses the peculiarity of this tale which mixes up history and fable. The other stories, he says, keep separated the fabulous and the historical elements. "History requires the truth, whether ancient or recent, and contains no marvels, or, at least, sparingly."<sup>47</sup> Measured by this standard, the barbarian sagas, as Strabo says with regard to the early history of Persians, Medes or Assyrians, seemed incredible. The tale of Romulus and Remus appeared to a Greek eye as a theatrical fiction.<sup>48</sup> For the same reason, the "occult" historical lore was presented as coming from a barbarian source. Egyptian priests tell about Atlantis. The priests in Panchaea inform Euhemerus of their Cretan origin.<sup>49</sup>

On the other hand, Greek method being inseparable from Greek material, the scientific pre-history became Hellenocentric. If the words of Pherecydes, "who was a genealogist inferior to none," about Oenotrus constitute the basis of a historical construction, the barbarian



tradition which never heard of Oenotrus and such must be false or, at least, mistaken.

Thus, the duty of a historian was to rectify the barbarian account or to substitute a scientific hypothesis for it. In both cases, the beginnings of a barbarian race were integrated into the system of Greek pre-history. A Greek inquirer in a foreign land did not feel himself bound by the question of what his informant actually meant. The construction he put upon the barbarian account was rather faithful to the historical reality of his own system. Some local legend about the origin of the Sauromatae reminded the Greeks of the Amazons. They connected it with their own saga: the female ancestors of the Sauromatae were the Amazons who, carried away as captives by the Greeks after the battle of the Thermodon, succeeded in escaping.<sup>50</sup>

Megasthenes is an excellent observer of Indian life. He gives a sound (though garbled) list of ancient Indian kings. But he asserts, on the authority of native scholars, that Dionysos and Herakles had civilized India.<sup>51</sup> That means that the information he obtained about Shiva and Krishna was understood by him as mistaken references to Greek pre-history. Thessalian officers of Alexander's army saw the Armenians. They concluded that the new people were descendants of Armenus, a Thessalian companion of Jason. An important piece of evidence was the long Armenian dress similar to the "Thessalian" robes of the tragic stage.<sup>52</sup> The argument is as good (or as bad) as the inference from the similarity of the earthenware to the kinship of peoples who use it, which occurs so often in modern archeological books. The most "up-to-date" scholars, like the father of history, cannot judge the evidence ex-

cept by their own canon of historical probability.

Strange as it may appear to day, the "pan-Hellenic" primeval theory was the necessary result of the belief in the historicity of the Greek saga. Similarly, Jewish and Christian scholars until the last century found a niche for each new people in the Biblical Table of Nations (Gen. 10). Even in the time of Voltaire, antiquarians in general had no doubt about the descent of the Chinese from a son of Noah. A learned author rejected the tradition of the Tartars as to their origin (together with "the fabulous dynasties of the Chaldeans and of the Egyptians") as inconsistent with Biblical data. In 1731 a well known Orientalist derived the Russians (who are Muscovites) from Mesech, a son of Japhet. He started from this principle: "It is well known that all peoples descend from Noah."<sup>53</sup>

## VI

It was easy to discover Greek ancestors for the Romans or for the Armenians. The relations between Greek pre-history and the past of the Levant was a more complicated problem. The Greek saga spoke of Phoenician (Cadmus), Phrygian (Pelops), Egyptian (Danaos) colonization of Greece. No Greek ever contested the antiquity of the Egyptian race, compared with which the Greeks were still children. Taking for granted their own gods and sagas, the Greeks naturally found them also in the East. Similarly, Catholic travellers to India and the Far East, such as Vasco da Gama, at first took the pictures of Hindu gods for holy images of Christian saints and believed that Buddhist lamas were followers of the Apostle Thomas.<sup>54</sup> The priests at Tyre convinced the Greek visitor that their Melcarth was his Herakles. On the other hand, Hero-

dotus could not doubt that the Egyptian god whom the Greeks called Herakles was Herakles.

Accordingly, he concluded (and very methodically proved) that the Greeks must have borrowed Herakles as well as many other gods from the Egyptians.<sup>55</sup> Plutarch, reads "philo-barbarism" into such statements.<sup>56</sup> But he wrote a half-millennium after Herodotus, when, as we shall see, the pan-Hellenic theory of the origins of mankind was violently attacked by Oriental critics. Herodotus' sole concern was to obtain what light he could from any quarter on the obscure points of the Hellenic saga. As he discusses the details that pass the bounds of probability, so he uses the information drawn from Eastern sources to remove various obstacles to the reader's entire faith in the Greek tradition. The differentiation between the primeval god Herakles, borrowed from the Egyptians, and the son of Alcmena, who lived only nine hundred years before Herodotus, solved some puzzling contradictions in the tradition and explained the dual cult, divine and heroic, of Herakles at Thasos.<sup>57</sup> The authentic story of Fair Helen, learned from the Egyptian priests, explains to Herodotus' satisfaction another historical enigma: why the Trojans had not delivered Helen to the Achaean host?<sup>58</sup>

The real difficulty was rather chronological. Counting the genealogies in their saga backward, the Greeks arrived at about 1800 B.C. as the beginning of history after the Ogygian deluge.<sup>59</sup> Yet, the Achaemenidae represented themselves as the successors of Ninus of Assyria, who first held sway over the world, around 2300 B.C.<sup>60</sup> Herodotus boldly made Ninus the third in descent from Herakles, lowering his date to *ca.* 1200 B.C. But the Egyptian list of some three hundred and thirty pharaohs

overwhelmed him. By miscalculation, he lengthened the pharaonic rule to more than eleven thousand years.<sup>61</sup> Dicaearchus, more exactly, put the beginning of Egyptian history in 3719 B.C.<sup>62</sup> Later, Berossus and Manetho produced their compilations of Babylonian and Egyptian royal lists, and censured the ignorance of Greek scholars.<sup>63</sup>

The latter avoided the issue. Ten thousand years of Egyptian history were referred to by Plato. Aristotle recognized that the Egyptian legislator Sesostris lived long before Minos, the first Greek lawgiver. Aristoxenus, Aristotle's pupil, spoke of three world empires: Assyrian, Median, Persian. Zoroaster was placed six thousand years before Plato.<sup>64</sup> But neither such isolated acknowledgments of Oriental evidence nor the admiration for Oriental wisdom which flourished among the Greek intelligentsia from Plato on,<sup>65</sup> affected the accepted reconstruction of the primeval history.

Using his theory of natural catastrophes which obliterate the memory of the past, Plato could more or less seriously make the Egyptians disciples of the antediluvian Athenians.<sup>66</sup> But, generally speaking, Greek scholars refused to believe the high figures advanced by Manetho and Berossus. They suspected that the latter pair only tried to glorify their own peoples.<sup>67</sup> Eratosthenes continued to assert that the age before Ogygos was a blank, the "unknown" period. Yet, on the same occasion, he extended the duration of the "mythical," or half-historical period, putting Ogygos back to *ca.* 2400 B.C.<sup>68</sup> A generation before Eratosthenes, the Seventy, by manipulating the figures in Genesis, extended the historical, post-diluvian period, by 685 years.<sup>69</sup> In both cases, the change was probably made in order to find place for Egyptian dynas-

ties. At last, in Caesar's time, Castor harmonized the Greek and Oriental chronologies. He dated the first historical king of the Orient, Ninus of Assyria, in 2123-2122 B.C. Significantly, he discovered a Greek contemporary of his, king Aigialeus of Sicily.<sup>70</sup>

Thus, Aristotle can regard the Egyptians as the most ancient of men, and with Plato limit the deluge of Deucalion chiefly to Greece, yet at the same time, speak, for instance, of Italus, the king of the Oenotrians, who gave his name to Italy.<sup>71</sup> Likewise, the most learned Alexandrian scholars continued to relate the beginnings of mankind everywhere to the Greek saga. Pola and Oricus in Illyria are foundations of the Colchians who pursued Jason. The Colchians themselves, as Herodotus supposed, are of Egyptian origin. Like the Galatae and the Celts, the Illyrians descend from a son of Polyphemus and Galatea. But Hylleis in Illyria are issue of Herakles, etc. etc.<sup>72</sup>

In exactly the same manner. Christian scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, admiring Confucius and recognizing the antiquity of Chinese civilizations, were not at all prepared to believe in the reality of P'an Ku, who was the first ruler of the universe, or of Sur Jen, the Chinese Prometheus.<sup>73</sup> But for them Peleg who lived two hundred and thirty-nine years, "and begot sons and daughters" was of the greatest historical importance because the Bible says that "in his days was the earth divided" (Gen. 10:25).

To understand this attitude let us remember that the discovery of Chinese Annals which (falsely) put the beginning of the Celestial Empire earlier than the Biblical date of the Flood, caused an ideological crisis in Europe and, as every reader of Voltaire knows, made a

breach in the spiritual armor of Christendom.<sup>74</sup> The unity of the Hellenic world was based on a common mythology. Being limited by no canon or scripture, the Greek tradition could be re-arranged and corrected (for internal reasons or in the light of new evidence) with impunity. But the general truth and authenticity of the primeval history was taken for granted. Aristotle found a historical kernel in the claim of the Arcadians to be older than the Moon. For Strabo, Herakles' and the Phoenician expeditions to Spain were equally real.<sup>75</sup> In order to ruin the reputation of Theopompus, the opinion was attributed to him that Athens was a colony of Egyptian Sais.<sup>76</sup> The acceptance of the Oriental chronology would have overthrown the whole system of Greek pre-history. The Christian authors, by using these Oriental data, succeeded in this anti-Hellenic task. Greek scholars instinctively shunned impairing the solidity of their faith. They continued to people the past with offspring of Odysseus and Herakles, and scorned the unbelievable chronological figures of Berossus and Manetho: the barbarians are either impudent or stupid or vain. Thus, having discovered a tree, peculiar to Egypt, which they called "Persea," the Greek scholars never doubted that it must have been brought to Egypt by Perseus, or, perhaps by the Persians.<sup>77</sup>

## VII

Under the double impact of Greek power and of Greek science, the barbarians, mostly ignorant of their own primitive history, as soon as they had become a bit hellenized, accepted the Greek schema of *archaiologia*. The Romans recognized Aeneas, the Callaici acknowledged Teucer as their ancestors. The Tarentines, being colonists from

Lacedaemon, "by flattery" attributed the same origin to their powerful Samnite neighbours, exactly as some centuries later the Roman Senate called the Aedui in Gaul "brothers and relations." By Cato's time, the Spartan descent of the Sabini (Samnites) already had become a part of the latter's national tradition.<sup>78</sup> In the time of the Athenian domination, and, then again, after Alexander the Great, kinship with the dominant race was a trump not to be neglected. The Maccabeans officially acknowledged that their people were relatives of the Lacedaemonians.<sup>79</sup>

But the ancient nations of the East soon learned to cope with the Greek ethnological method even as they succeeded in producing local imitations of Greek wares and of Athenian coins. The Lydians were the first "hellenized" people. Xanthus the Lydian, following the Greek patterns of thought, set out a "pan-Lydian" theory. In the first place, he passed over the Heraclidae, who, according to the Greeks, were the ancient rulers of Sardis. He began with Manes, the first man, who was of course a Lydian and whose progeny reigned in Sardis long before Herakles. Tantalus was for him a Lydian chieftain. Mopsus, obviously the founder of the Cilician city of the same name, was also Lydian. Ascalon got her name from a Lydian general Ascalus. In this Lydian scheme, Xanthus put in some Homeric data, but not without testing them. He, for instance, found Niobe in the Lydian annals by identifying her with a figure of Asianic mythology. She was not the daughter of Tantalus (who lived much earlier) but of Assaon.<sup>80</sup>

About 300 B.C. Hecataeus of Abdera published a "pan-Egyptian" theory. He, of course, often follows Herodotus. It is also difficult to say how real are the "Egyptians" in whose name he speaks.<sup>81</sup>

Yet, at his time, there surely were Egyptian priests, versed in both national and Greek traditions, as Manetho some years later, who had read Herodotus. We may think of some one like Petosiris, priest of Hermupolis Magna, the decorations of whose grave show such a curious blend of Egyptian and Hellenic elements.<sup>82</sup> According to Hecataeus the civilization came from Egypt, more than ten thousand years before Alexander. Babylon was founded by the Egyptian Belus, Athens was a colony from Sais, Herakles was an Egyptian general and so on and so on. The Greeks simply appropriated to themselves the most renowned Egyptian gods and heroes as well as the colonies sent out by the Egyptians.<sup>83</sup>

The theme was then taken up by other Oriental peoples. Around 100 B.C., flushed by the Maccabean success, the Jews set forth the pan-Hebrew theory: Meroe in Ethiopia was founded by Moses and named after the Egyptian princess who had adopted him. Even the worship of animals in Egypt was an invention of Moses.<sup>84</sup> Other Oriental peoples did not forget their own claims. About 280 B.C. the Chaldeans already glorified the conquests of Nabuchodonosor who was among them "more famous than Herakles" as a Greek author notes with astonishment.<sup>85</sup> No less a man than Posidonius seriously assured his readers that not only did geometry come to the Greeks from Egypt and astronomy and arithmetic from Sidon, but that the Sidonian Mochus, before the Trojan war, invented the atomic theory.<sup>86</sup>

Echoing these claims later, Josephus in the name of the Jews, and Philo of Byblus speaking for the Phoenicians, repeat that the Greeks, when they rose to power, appropriated the deeds and glories of the older Oriental peoples.<sup>87</sup>

A methodical device of Greek ethnology was to explain the loss of a (real or supposed) Greek geographical name by the barbarian influence.<sup>88</sup> Using the same hypothesis, Josephus sets forth that, under Greek influence, many peoples whose names are in the Table of Nations of Genesis have changed them and, thus, obliterated their origins. Philo of Byblus says the same with respect to the Phoenician origin of Greek gods and cities. Athena was the daughter of Kronos, the king of Byblus.

The Greeks rarely dared to controvert such claims. Some one, for instance, suggested that the alphabet which was generally regarded as a Phoenician (or Egyptian) invention was originally discovered by the Heliades at Rhodes. Forgotten because of the Deluge, it was brought back to the Greeks by Cadmus. A similar theory of the same character was to make Sais an Athenian colony.<sup>89</sup> Such assertions hardly convinced anybody.

On the other hand, the Greek method itself was found wanting. The rule of avoiding "absurd etymologies" in tracing the origin of a people was of course excellent. But in the absence of a comparative philology how was one to know whether the erudite Philoxenos was right or not in asserting that Latin is a dialect of Greek, akin to Aeolian?<sup>90</sup> The Greek ethnological school insisted on the importance of rites for tracing the origins of a people, because men cling to ancient beliefs and ceremonies. But following this method, Timaeus discovered in the Roman ceremony of *equus October* a reminiscence of the wooden horse which was fatal to Ilion. Polybius with his usual common sense observed that in this case any people sacrificing horses would be of Trojan descent.<sup>91</sup> The danger of arguing from similarities is overlooked not only by the comparatists of today.

### VIII

A new methodical approach was necessary. It is fitting that it should appear for the first time under the pen of Caesar. His solution is simple: to reproduce the native account: *Galli se omnes ab Dite patre prognatos praedicant idque ab druidibus proditum dicunt*. He discovers the British Isles, and tells about the inhabitants. *Britanniae pars interior ab iis incolitur quos natos in insula ipsa memoria proditum dicunt, maritima pars ab iis qui . . . ex Belgio transierunt*.<sup>92</sup> It was so to speak a Copernican discovery. For the learned theories which reduced all pre-history to a prolongation of Greek mythology, this new method substituted the pragmatic approach of accepting the native tradition. Of course, Greek scholarship often did the same. For instance, Polybius prefers one account of the origins of the city of Locri in Italy to another because the former is confirmed by the Locrians themselves.<sup>93</sup> But in such cases, the tradition is of Greek origin or, at least, agrees with the Greek world-thought and can be fitted into Greek history. But in Britain neither Caesar nor his scholarly followers discovered any trace of Herakles or Dionysius. Diodorus notes this anomaly.<sup>94</sup> The new method conquered the learned world by leaps and bounds. Dionysius follows it in his pre-history of Rome. He expressly states that he gives the record as "he had received it from the inhabitants of the country."<sup>95</sup> For the primitive history of Africa Sallust gives the version found "in Punic books." Timagenes, introducing Herakles in the early history of the Gauls, expressly names the opinion of the inhabitants and their written sources as his authority. Tacitus is unable to say, in the absence of native tradition, who were the first inhabitants of Britain.<sup>96</sup>



This empirical approach suited the Roman writers who, as a rule, were not scholars but soldiers and politicians. In writing about the *Origines* of Italian peoples, Cato generally gave the native tradition, although, of course, he repeated the Greek scholarly version, when the latter already had been accepted in the learned world. For instance, he believed in the Trojan ancestry not only of the Romans but also of the Venetes or of the city of Politorium.<sup>97</sup> Later Roman authors followed the same method: for Sardinia, for instance, Sallust repeats Greek accounts,<sup>98</sup> Tacitus does it with respect to the Jews. But the Roman authors themselves hardly construct erudite theories. When Cato does not know the origins of the pre-Etruscan Pisa, he says so. He says that it is impossible to give precisely the origins of the Ligurians because they do not know anything certain about themselves: *sed unde oriundi sunt exacta memoria. Inlitterati, mendacesque sunt et vera minus meminere.*<sup>99</sup>

Yet, it would be too rash to ascribe the new approach to Roman genius. Apollonius Molon, for instance, already gives the pre-history of Israel in general agreement with the Bible.<sup>100</sup> When F. Jacoby's collection of the fragments of Greek historians, accompanied by his commentary, is completed, we shall probably discover Greek predecessors of the Caesarian method. Let us, however, repeat: the originality of the Caesarian approach is not in quoting the indigenous tradition respecting the origins of a people, but in accepting it by virtue of its being an indigenous account.

## IX

Nevertheless, the new historical approach in its turn had its deficiencies. In the first place, with rare exceptions

(the Greeks, the Jews), all the peoples, the Babylonians as well as the Britanni, claimed to be autochthonous: the noblest origin in the eyes of the Greeks. Then, if they were a literate people, the barbarians, as Diodorus already notes, pretended to have the earliest history on record.<sup>101</sup> As Josephus says, every nation endeavors to trace its own origins back to the remotest date in order not to appear to be imitators of others.<sup>102</sup> A half-civilized people, on the other hand, as we have already observed, simply used Greek myths for their own tradition. *Arvernique ausi Latio se fingere fratres sanguine ab Iliaco populi.*<sup>103</sup> The net result of the new method would have been the disintegration of the primeval history. The Greek approach (arbitrary as it appears to us), as well as the use of the Biblical Table of Nations, produced integrated (although fictitious in our eyes) views on the beginning of mankind.

Thus, the Greek study of pre-history ended in a blind alley. The scholars turned to an uncomfortable agnosticism. They registered conjectures about the beginning of people, without making a choice, or choosing the best known variant: *plurimi auctores consentiunt*. Trogus Pompeius and Strabo, solemnly, repeat the absurd invention of some flatterer of Pompeius that the Albanians, on the west side of the Caspian, were from Italian Alba Longa.<sup>104</sup> Tacitus believes in the Egyptian origin of the Jews, and Plutarch gives the accepted foundation story for Rome. Compilation takes the place of conjecture.

Of course, the means at the disposal of Greek scholars were inadequate for the task. When deprived of the help of linguistics, modern scholars are no more fortunate than their Greek predecessors: the problem of the origins of the



Etruscans, for instance, is still the same as in the time of Herodotus.

Yet, Posidonius attempted to group peoples according to their affinity, as established by observation. He noted, for instance, that the Armenians, the Syrians, and the Arabs show their mutual kinship by similarity of language, custom and bodily structure. He also coupled the Assyrians and the Arians together. He noted that the customs of the Medes and the Armenians are essentially the same because their lands are similar. He stressed the similarity between the Celts and the Germans. He spoke of Celtiberians or of Gallograeci, that is of peoples formed in the historical process, without seeking for them a mythical ancestor.<sup>105</sup> As mistaken as his etymological chain — Armenians - Arameans - Arabs - Homer's Eremboi — was, this reconstruction of the pre-history avoided the recourse to mythology. But his anthropogeographical method, as it seems, found no followers.

Aside from Posidonius and the few adepts of the pragmatistical approach, Greek scholarship from Hecataeus until the victory of Christian erudition with its Table of Nations, continued to use the pan-Hellenic reconstruction of the first age of mankind. The Lydians, the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Phoenicians, the Jews protested in vain. In the time of Polybius, works of *Origines* of peoples and cities continued to be popular among the public.<sup>106</sup> This complacent and supine attitude was fostered by the finality of the Greek universe. The discovery of America ruined the medieval view of the world and breached the Christian thought-world. The question arose, for instance, whether the aborigines of the new continent were Adamites, and whether Jesus had come also for their salvation.<sup>107</sup> The

Greeks never received such a shock. Aristotle could say: we know the whole inhabited world in breadth. The *oikoumene* of Strabo was still that of Hecataeus.<sup>108</sup> The latter knew Tartessus in the West as well as Chorasmia and the river Indus in the East. To be sure, the *oikoumene* became better known in details. But the scholars occupied new lands by extending their research from one country to its neighbour, around the Mediterranean. Thus, Greek mythology could step in with the warrior and the merchant discovering new countries. The first European (Roman) traveller came to Ceylon from India which was regarded as the land of Herakles. Accordingly, he reported that the population of the island worshiped Herakles.<sup>109</sup> Poets and utopians dreamed of the world beyond the Ocean, yet Pytheas who attempted to go beyond the Outer Sea was scoffed at.<sup>110</sup> But Columbus went *al nuevo cielo y mundo*.<sup>111</sup>

## X

The Trojan origin of Rome and similar inventions pose a twofold question. Why did Greeks attribute Greek ancestry to barbarians? Why did the latter accept the Greek interpretation of their national origins? The answer given in this paper is a simple one: because the Greeks, and they alone, tried to reconstruct the pre-history of mankind. For the Egyptians, as for many primitive tribes, the word "men" meant themselves only. The Bible taught the unity of mankind. We all are sons of Adam, and the chosen people is only a secondary branch on the common stem. This meek idea made pre-history static for the Hebrews. The Greek world view was aggressive and Hellenocentric. Nations continued to be formed through expansion and division. As a rule, the motor force of change was some Greek

hero. The Greek approach was dynamical, that is historical. History denotes change, motion, life. The Jews could mechanically transfer an old name to some new people. First the Macedonians, then the Romans received the name of Kittim, which originally referred to the inhabitants of Citium (Cyprus). Such identification is purely nominal. But if the Romans descend from Aeneas, this fact belongs to and creates history. The Greek, Hellenocentric, approach failed to solve the problem. But are modern theories much

better? The "Cro-Magnon" race of our textbooks or the "Semites" as the substratum of "Semitic" languages are fictions of a different kind but hardly of a higher value than the Trojan origin of Rome. The remarkable fact remains that Greeks conceived the idea of common inheritance of all peoples, and tried to understand the common past of mankind historically. As so often in Greek science, they failed because they attempted too much.

LOS ANGELES

#### NOTES

1. Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 4. 2. Cf. 1. 3. 5; 1. 75. 4. According to A. Klotz (*RhM.*, LXXXVII [1938], 38-40) Juba had preceded Dionysius in presenting the Roman legend to the Greek public. Throughout the notes the following abbreviations are used: J = F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, I-III, B (1923-50); Lewis, see n. 2; Norden = Ed. Norden, *Die Germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania* (3d ed., 1923); P = H. Peter, *Historiarum Romanorum reliquiae*, I (2d ed., 1914); Pearson, see n. 12; Perret, see n. 2; Pinot, see n. 53.

2. Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 72-73; Plut. *Rom.* 2; Festus, s.v. "Romam"; Servius *ad Aen.* 1. 273. Any discussion of the Roman foundation legends must now start from J. Perret, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome* (1942), although his own hypothesis is refuted by evidence overlooked by the author. Cf. CW, XXXVII (1943), 93-95. Among the earlier works, G. C. Lewis (*An Inquiry Into the Credibility of the Early Roman History*, I [1855], Chapters VIII-X), gives a clear and complete account of the traditions concerning the primitive history of Rome. Perret, pp. xxv-xxx supplies an up-to-date bibliography.

3. J. Bayet, *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (1926), pp. 127-54; J. Berard, *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie méridionale* (1941), pp. 385-94, 421-37. Heracles enters into the Roman foundation legends indirectly. Cf. Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 34; also F. Sbordone, "Il ciclo italico di Eracle," *Athenaeum*, 1941, pp. 32-96, 49-80.

4. J. Bayet, "Les origines de l'arcadisme romain," *Mélanges*, XXV (1920), 63-141.

5. The earliest text which mentions Evander is Fabius Pictor, Frag. 1 P. According to Serv. *ad Aen.* 8. 130 the name occurred in Hesiod.

6. Hesiod *Theog.* 1011. "Agrios," Latinus' brother, named in the same passage, may be Silvius of Alba Longa. Cf. M. Durante in *La Parola del Passato* (1951), p. 216. On Latinus also cf. the so called Scymnus *Periopl.* 227 (*Geogr. Graec. Minor.* I). Following some earlier authority (5th or 4th c. B.C.) Xenagoras (240, Frag. 29 J = Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 72. 5) relates that Romus, Antelas, and Ardelas, sons of Odysseus and Circe, built their eponymous cities.

7. The founder was Romus, "Tyrant" of the Latins who had driven out the Etruscans (Anon. *apud Plut. Rom.* 2); Romus was the son of Zeus (Antigonus, *FHG*, IV, 305 (Festus)); Rome was a Pelasgian (Plut. *Rom.* 1) or Tyrrhenian foundation (Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 29). Cf. also Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 10.

8. K. O. Müller in 1819 (quoted in Lewis p. 343) tried to explain the legend of Aeneas in Latium as the reflection of a later historical fact. On the current views cf. my review of Perret (*supra* n. 2).

9. H. Grotius, *De origine gentium Americanarum* (1643). I quote the summary of the books from De B. Rigney, *Life of . . . Grotius* (Eng. Trans., 1754), p. 275.

10. Cf. Norden, p. 184.

11. Strabo 3. 157 (quoting Asclepiades of Myrleia); Just. 44. 3. 3. Cf. Norden, p. 163.

12. Hellanicus 4, Frag. 84 J. (Dion. Hal. 1. 72. 2). Cf. L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (1939), pp. 152-57. Before Hellanicus, Antiochus of Syracuse referred to Rome, speaking of a certain "Siculus who had been banished from Rome" (555 Frag. 6 J = Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 73. 4). But despite this mythological reference, he, as we may infer from Dionysius, did not deal with the origins of Rome. Cf. Varro *De lingua latina* 5. 101: *a Roma orti Siculi ut annales veteres nostri dicunt*.

13. On the reading of the passage cf. P. Boyance, *REA*, XLV (1943), 280.

14. Strabo 6. 264. Cf. Plut. *Quest. Rom.* 6; K. Robert, *Griechische Heldensagen*, II, (1923), 1500-2; Bérard (*supra* n. 3), p. 381. The Achaean castaways in Latium: Aristotle, Frag. 609 Rose = *FHG*, II, 178, No. 242 (Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 72. 3). It is surprising that the passage is referred by modern scholars to the foundation of Rome. It is only Heraclides Lembos who connected the anecdote with Rome (*FHG*, III, 168 (Festus, Servius)). Plutarch (*Quest. Rom.* 6; *Rom.* 1; *De mul. virt.* 243 E) repeats Hellanicus' account.

15. Coins: B. V. Head, *Hist. Num.* (1911), p. 214; Thuc. 6. 2. 3. On the statues from Veii see bibliography in Ch. Picard, *REL*, XXV (1937), 374. Add G. Bendinelli, *RFIC*, LXXVI (1948), 88-92 (with a plate). On Aeneas in Epirus and Zacyntus cf. epigraphical evidence quoted in my review of Perret (*supra* n. 2).

16. On this period of migrations cf. Thuc. 1. 12; Strabo 3. 150; Plato *Leg.* 3. 682 E.

17. Agathocles 472, Frag. 5 J = *FHG* IV, 290 (Festus): *Agathocles Cyzicenarum rerum conscriptor ait, vaticinio Heleni impulsus Aenean Italiam petivisse, portantem suam secum neptem, Ascanii filiam, nomine Rhomen*. Cf. Perret, pp. 380-84. Romulus and Remus are children of Aeneas and Dexithea (Plut. *Rom.* 2.2). Further, cf. Schol. Lycophr. *Alex.* 1226 and Perret, p. 467.

18. Festus loc. cit.: *Apollodorus in Euxenide ait Aeneas et Lavinia natos Mayllem (?) <Ro>mulum Rhomumque*

atque ab Romo urbi tractum nomen. Who was Apollodorus? What does "Euxenis" mean? Cf. Lewis, p. 398; Robert (*supra* n. 14), p. 1598, n. 3.

19. Dionysius of Chalcis, *FHG*, IV, 395, Frag. 11 (Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 72. 6). Cf. Plut. *Rom.* 2 and Perret, p. 388. See also Hellan. 4, Frag. 23 J; Cassius Hemina, Frag. 7 P (Solin. 2. 14).

20. Cf. J. Carcopino, *La louve du Capitole* (1925); also *Bull. de l'Assoc. G. Budé*, 1924 and 1925. For further bibliography see A. Pignaniol, *Histoire de Rome* (2d ed., 1946), p. 39. F. Duhn (*Gnomon*, II [1926], 136-42) dates the statue not later than the middle of the 5th c. On later monuments picturing the twins cf. A. Rosenberg, *RE*, I A, 1981-82.

21. Livy 10. 23. 11. On the coins cf. J. G. Milne, "The Problem of the Early Roman Coinage," *JRS*, XXXVI (1946), 98 (who suggests 289 as the date and a mint in Campania) and H. Mattingly, "The First Age of the Roman Coinage," *JRS*, XXXV (1945), 66 (date: 269; mint at Rome). The obverse of these coins shows Hercules. According to Mattingly, this alludes to the legend that the hero was the ancestor of the gens *Fabia*, a member of which was consul in 269 B.C.

22. Cf. G. Macdonald, *Coin Types* (1905), pp. 104-10.

23. It is not necessary to discuss here the problem of Diocles of Peparethus. According to Plutarch (*Rom.* 3 and 8) Fabius Pictor followed Diocles, or rather his version (*logos*). Cf. Lewis, p. 82, n. 24 and Perret, pp. 471-500. Perhaps, as Th. Mommsen (*Röm. Forsch.*, II, 279) suggested, Fabius quoted Diocles as his authority, for instance, on the story of Aeneas. Cf. also F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (1949), p. 286, n. 88. On the relationship between Romulus and Aeneas in Naevius see Serv. *ad Aen.* 1. 273 and 6. 777. The same scholiast writes: *Eratosthenes Aeneas filii <filium> Romulum parentem urbis refert*. *Erat.* 241, Frag. 45 J. But I doubt the authenticity of the fragment which may come from one of the later adaptations of Eratosthenes' tables. Cf. Apollod. 244, Frags. 83-87 J. Note that Eratosthenes did not speak of Euandrus but of the Italian Sibyl (Sch. Plato *Phaedr.* 244 B., *apud* W. C. Greene, *Scholía Platonica* [1938], p. 79).

24. Callias 564, Frag. 5 J = *FHG*, II, 382, Frag. 5 *apud* Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 72. 5, and Festus s. v. "Romam," p. 269 M (329 L), where the name is corrupt (Caltinus, Calites). Cf. Th. Mommsen, "Die Remuslegende," *Hermae*, XVI (1881), 3-5 (*Gesamm. Schr.*, IV, 3-4); Perret, pp. 402-8. "Cleinius" *apud* Serv. *ad Aen.* 1. 273 is, probably, identical with Callias.

25. Alcimus 560, Frag. 4 J = *FHG*, IV, 297, Frag. 6 *apud* Festus *loc. cit.* His date is uncertain; cf. Perret, p. 386: *Alcimus ait Tyrrhenia Aeneae natum filium Romulum fuisse atque co ortam Albam, Aeneae nepem, cuius filium nomine Rhomus condiderit urbem Romam.*

26. Hegeslan. 45, Frags. 9 and 8 J. A similar hypothesis is found in Dion. Hal. (*AR* 1. 73. 3). Cf. also Perret, pp. 309-20 and 388-94. On the legendary founders of Capua, cf. Hecat. 1, Frag. 62 J (with commentary); J. Heurgon, *Capoue pré-Romaine* (1942), p. 144.

27. Pol. 6. 11 A (*apud* Dion. Hal. 1. 32. 4) Cato Frag. 11 P.

28. Callimachus (ed. R. Pfeiffer, 1949), I, Frag. 107. Rome and Segesta in 263 B.C.: Zonar. 8.9 (cf. Perret, pp. 452-54). Cf. generally Ed. Norden, "Vergils Aeneis im Lichte ihrer Zeit," *NJb.*, VII (1901), 324-28; M. Holleaux, *Rome, la Grèce, et les monarchies hellénistiques* (1923), pp. 5-22 46-58. Flamininus: Plut. *Flam.* 12, Aristoph. Byz. *apud* Sch. Eur. *Troi.* 44; Perret, p. 516.

29. Lycophr. *Alex.* 1232ff. The hypothesis that Lycophron depends on Timaeus is without foundation. Cf. Perret, pp. 346-67 and 441-49 and (against his own conjecture that the source is Fabius Pictor) A. Momigliano, *JRS*, XXXV (1945), 102; also R. Laquer, *RE* s. v. "Timaioi," VI A, 1174-88; *Anth. Pal.* 3. 19.

30. Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 4. 2. Cf. H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom* (1938), p. 14.

31. Jos. *Contra Ap.* 1. 3; 1. 217, etc.

32. Tac. *Hist.* 5. 2-3. Cf. Isid. Lévy, "Tacite et l'origine du peuple juif," *Latomus*, V (1946), 331-40. But I am not at all sure that the identification with the Solymi (also referred to Jos. *Contra Ap.* 1. 22, 173 and *Ant. Jud.* 7. 3. 2, 67) comes from a Jewish pen.

33. Cf. I. Heinemann, *RE*, XVI, 359, s. v. "Moses." Philo (*De vita Mos.* 1.2) believed that Greeks by envy did not speak of Moses.

34. Herod. 1. 171-72 (cf. Thuc. 1. 4 and 8. 1); Thuc. 6. 2. 6. On various theories respecting the populations of Sicily, cf. Hellan. 4, Frag. 79 J; Ephor. 70, Frag. 36 J (with commentary); Diod. 5. 6; Pearson pp. 228-30.

35. On Achaemenes see Herod. 1. 125; 3. 75; 7. 11. On Perscus, e.g., cf. Herod. 6. 54; 7. 61; Hellan. 4, Frags. 59-60 J; Nic. Damasc. 90, Frag. 6 J. Hellanicus readily acknowledges that viticulture, etc. are barbarian inventions: 4, Frags. 175, 178 b, 189 J. Cf. M. Rostowzew, *Skythien und der Bosphorus* (1931), p. 22.

36. Callim. (ed. Pfeiffer), Frag. 379; Timaeus, 566 Frag. 69 J (*FHG*, I, 200, Frag. 37). On the Cimbrici cf. Poscid. 87, Frag. 31 J; Norden, pp. 67-80; 466-70.

37. Strabo 3. 139 and 157; cf. 12. 573.

38. Herod. 1. 94. 6. On the Pelasgian theory cf. Hellan. 4, Frag. 4 J (with commentary); Callim., Frags. 97 and 199 (ed. Pfeiffer, pp. 224-45); Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 27; Tac. *Ann.* 4. 55; J. Bérard, "La question des origines étrusques," *REA*, LI (1949), 202-45.

39. Herod. 4. 191; 2. 99 and 142. Cf. generally F. Jacoby, s. v. "Herodotus," *RE*, Suppl. II, 400.

40. Herod. 5. 57. Cf. F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (1949), p. 397, n. 47.

41. Cf. Ephor. 70, Frag. 119 J (with commentary).

42. Hecat. 1, Frag. 27 J; Herod. 4. 150-61.

43. Antigonus = *FHG*, IV, 305 (*supra* n. 7 and Plut. *Rom.* 17. 5); Zenodotus: *FHG*, IV, 531 (Plut. *Rom.* 14. 8; Solin. 2. 9). On Caeculus cf. Cato, Frag. 59 P. and Solin, *loc. cit.*: *ut Praenestini sonant libri a Caeculo.*

44. Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 11-13. Jos. *BJ* 1. 17. On the Greek *archaologia* cf. Norden, p. 46; Ed. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1913), p. 372; A. Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," *JWarb.*, XIII (1950), 287.

45. Eratosth. 244, Frag. 1 J. J. B. Vico (*Scienza Nuova*, I, chap. 1) still follows this classification of Eratosthenes-Varro.

46. Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 34.

47. Strabo 11. 504.

48. Strabo 11. 507; Plut. *Rom.* 8. 9. Roman authors apologize for the miraculous element in Rome's origins. Livy *Praef.*; Pliny *HN* 8. 22. 61.

49. Plato *Crit.* 113 A; Diod. 5. 46. 3. Cf. Euhem. 62, Frag. 1 J. Dionysius Scytobrachion refers to the native "traditions" in the same vein. Cf. Diod. 3. 65. 2; 66. 4; also Pearson, pp. 110-12.

50. Herod. 4. 110; Rostowzew (*supra* n. 35), p. 100 and M. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks* (1922), pp. 34 and 107. Cf. G. Dumézil, *Latomus*, V (1946), 249-55 on the Greek interpretation of a Scythian legend in Herod. 4. 67.

51. Megasthen. *apud* Diod. 2. 38-39; Strabo 3. 171. Cf. generally O. Stein, s. v. "Megasthenes," *RE*, XV, 255 and 310. On the other hand, in Sanscrit literature, Greeks are represented as descendants of an Indian prince. See S. Lévi, *Quid de Graecis veterum Indorum monumenta tradiderint* (Thèse, Paris, 1890), p. 20.

52. Cysyllus and Medius 129-30, Frag. 1 J (Strabo 11. 530); Just. 42. 2. 10.

53. For China cf., e.g., N. Freret's papers read in the Académie des inscriptions in 1733 and 1739, quoted in V. Pinot, *La Chine et la formation de l'esprit philosophique en France* (1932), p. 272. Cf. also L. Le Comte, *Nouveaux mémoires sur l'état présent de la Chine* (1696) and P. Ber-

geron, *Histoire des Tatares* (1634) quoted in J. G. Atkinson, *Les relations de voyages du XVII<sup>e</sup> s.* (1924), p. 91 and 145. Chr. Schoettgen, *De origine Russorum* (1731) p. 2: *in originibus autem et migrationibus haece describendis ita nos gerimus: notum est omnes gentes originem a Noacho derivare*. Mesech (Gen. 10: 2) is called Mosoch in the Septuagint, *unde factum est Moscorum et Moscovitarum derivatio*. Herod. (3. 94) also speaks of "Moschoi," etc. Schoettgen is the learned author of the *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae in universum Novum Testamentum* (1733 et 1742 [ca. 2000 pp. in quarto]).

54. G. Atkinson, *Les nouveaux horizons de la renaissance française* (1935), pp. 81, 84, 275; L. Olshchki, *Storia letteraria delle scoperte geografiche* (1937), pp. 173-76; Pinot, pp. 283 and 290; H. H. Hart, *Sea Road to the Indies* (1950), p. 177. Believing (on the authority of the apocryphal correspondence of Seneca with Paul) that Seneca was a Christian, Boccaccio, in 1373, understood the philosopher's libation to Iuppiter Liberator (Tac. *Ann.* 15. 64) as an offering to Jesus; cf. A. Momigliano, "Note sulla legenda del cristianesimo di Seneca," *Riv. stor. it.*, LXII (1950), 337.

55. Herod. 2. 43-4 and 2. 145.

56. Plut. *De malign. Herod.* 12-14.

57. On the dual worship of Herakles at Thasos (Herod. 2. 44) cf. A. D. Nock, *AJA*, LII (1948), 299-300.

58. Herod. 2. 113-20. On the Oriental *logioi* (*homines literati*) who were Herodotus' informants cf. F. Jacoby, *Atthis* (1949), p. 389, n. 5. The Chinese said that Gutenberg learned from them the art of printing, brought to Europe by merchants through Russia (Gonzales de Mendoza [1589] quoted in Atkinson [*supra* n. 54], p. 58).

59. On Herodotus' mythical chronology cf. W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, I (1912), 439. Ogygos and the Deluge were placed 1020 years before the first Olympiad (that is in 1796 B.C.) by the chronographers. Cf. Philoch. 328, Frag. 92 J (Eus. *Præp. Evang.* 10. 7). The author of the *Marmor Parium* begins the chronography with Ceroops in 1582 B.C. (see 239, Frag. 1 J).

60. Cf. J. W. Swain, "The Theory of the Four Monarchies," *CP*, XXXV (1940), 5-7; G. Goossens, "L'histoire d'Assyrie de Ctésias," *Ant. Cl.* IX (1940), 25-45.

61. Herod. 1. 7; 2. 142-43. Cf. K. v. Fritz, "Herodotus," *TAPA*, LXXVII (1935), 332-36. Herodotus may have here followed Hecataeus. Cf. G. de Sanctis, "Intorno al razionalismo di Ecateo," *RFIC*, LXI (1933), 1-15; also G. Nenci, "La filobarbaria di Ecateo," *RFIC*, LXXVII (1949), 107-17.

62. Dicaearchus, Frag. 58 (ed. F. Wehrli, 1946), *apud* Sch. *Apoll.* Rhod. 4. 272-74.

63. See P. Schnabel, *Berosos* (1923) and Manetho (ed. W. G. Waddell [Loeb Library]). According to V. V. Struve ("Manetho's Royal List," *Vestnik Drevn. Ist.*, 1946, No. 4, pp. 9-25), Manetho's historical period began in 4242 B.C.

64. See Plato *Leg.* 2. 656 E; Arist. *Pol.* 7. 9. 4. 1329b 25; Aristox., Frag. 50 (ed. F. Wehrli, 1945) *apud* Athen. 12. 545 (cf. *Pol.* 38. 22). On Zoroaster cf. J. Bidez, F. Cumont, *Les Mages hellénisés*, I (1938), 12.

65. Cf. A. J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (1944), pp. 19-44.

66. Plato *Tim.* 23 D. Cf. *Crit.* 108 E. A. E. Taylor, *Commentary on Plato's Timaeus* (1928), p. 52.

67. Syncell. 17 A.

68. Varro *apud* Censor. *De die nat.* 21, who follows Eratosthenes. Cf. Eratosth. 241, Frag. 1 J. R. G. Collingwood (*The Idea of History*, 1946, p. 26) notes that, Greek historical method being based on "a cross-questioning of eyewitnesses," the backward extension of Greek history was necessarily limited.

69. Cf. J. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1875), p. 50. See also Curtius in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, I, 397. Because of "long" Chinese chronology, the Jesuits in

China used the figures of the Seventy and not the dates of the Vulgate, translated from the Hebrew. See Pinot pp. 150 and 220.

70. Castor 250, Frag. 1 J. Lists of Egyptian kings attributed by Christian authors to Eratosthenes and Apollodorus are apocryphal. Eusebius, imitating Eratosthenes, begins the historical period with Abraham (2016 B.C.). There were heretics who opposed Greek, Egyptian and Persian chronologies to the Biblical account of the division of earth among Noah's sons. Philastrius *Haer.* 93 (121).

71. Arist. *Meteor.* 1. 14. 352a 35; 352b 21; *Pol.* 7. 1329b 8.

72. Callim. Frag. 672 (ed. Pfeiffer); Appian. *Illyr.* 2; Apoll. Rhod. *Argon.* 4. 538.

73. Cf. Pinot pp. 252-59.

74. Cf. e.g., P. Hazard, *La crise de la conscience européenne*, I (1935), 53-62; Pinot, pp. 189-280. According to *Encic. Italiana*, X, 290, s. v. "Cina," the date for the first Chinese emperor, 2357 B.C. (or according to another tradition, 2145 B.C.), is based on later calculations of Chinese historians. The historical period in China begins ca. 1500 B.C.

75. Arist. *FHG*, II, 532, Frag. 89; Strabo 3. 149; Eratosth. *apud* Strabo 15. 687.

76. Anaxim. 72, Frag. 20. J, repeated by Charax 103, Frag. 39 J.

77. Cf. *De die*, I. 19. 36; Callim., Frag. 655 (ed. Pfeiffer); Diod. 1. 34; Plin. *HN* 15. 46; cf. Steier, *RE*, XIX, 940-44.

78. Just. 44. 3. 3; Strabo 5. 250; Caes. *BG* 1. 33; Cato, Frags. 50-51 P (Dion. Hal. *AR* 2. 49; Serv. ad *Aen.* 8. 638). Cf. Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 73 (Roman authors who made Romulus and Remus Aeneas' sons). Cf. Perret, p. 465. Cf. Dion. Hal. *AR* 2. 14: *ὁ ἐν ἱστορίαις ἐπιχρῶντος λεγόμενος λόγος*.

79. See, e.g., *Mélanges René Dussaud*, I (1938), 91-98.

80. Xanthus, *FHG*, I, 36-44. Cf. Nic. Damasc. 90, Frags. 15 and 22 J; Pearson (*supra* n. 12); Lammert, *RE*, XIII, 2206; Lesky, *RE*, XIV, 1051. On the Heraclides in Lydia see Herod. 1. 7. According to the Greeks (Strabo 13. 625), Sardis was founded only after the Trojan war. According to the Lydians, on the other hand, Asia was named after a grandson of their first ancestor (Manes); Herod. 4. 45. Tantalus: Xanthus *apud* Nic. Damasc. 90, Frag. 18 J. On Mopsus see Xanthus *apud* Athen. 8. 346 E. On the house of Mopsus (*Mupsh*) mentioned in a Phoenician inscription cf. Isid. Lévy in *La nouvelle Clé*, No. 3 (1950) p. 188. He notes that Callinus, the earliest Greek elegiac poet, had already identified the Oriental king Mopsus with the Greek seer of the same name. Mopsus was regarded as the ancestor of the Pamphilians. Callim., Frag. 200b (ed. Pfeiffer). On Niobe cf. Parthen. 33; Nic. Damasc. 90, Frag. 18 J; A. Lesky, *RE*, XVII, 665. On Homeric references in Xanthus cf. Pearson, pp. 124-27.

81. Hecat. 264, Frag. 25 J (with commentary, pp. 82-85). Just. 2. 1. 5: *inter Scythas et Aegyptios du contentio de generis vetustate fuerit*. Such disputes between the barbarian literati followed the patterns established by the Greeks: Argos and Athens contested for the glory of being the oldest city in Greece. See Paus. 1. 14. 2, who quotes the Argives as saying that Triptolemus was the son of a priest of Argos. Cf. also G. Daux, *Delphes* (1936), pp. 369ff.

82. Cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, I (1940), p. 82.

83. Hecataeus *apud* Diod. 1. 17. 20, 23-24, 28-29. "Macedon" in this list is probably to be identified with a companion of Osiris in Egyptian mythology. Cf. M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, II (1950), 983.

84. Artapanus *apud* Eus. *Præp. evang.* 9. 27. 431.

Cf. also J. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1875), pp. 224 and 230; Juba 275 T. 10 J; Isid. Lévy, "Moïse en Egypte," *Rev. étud. juiv.*, LIII (1907), 201-11.

85. Megasthen. *apud* Strabo 15. 686.

86. Posid. 87, Frag. 67 J (Strabo 16. 757).

87. Jos. *AJ* 1. 120; Philo Bybl. *FHG*, III, 560-71 (Eus. *Praep. evang.* 1. 10. 29). Cf. *Corp. Hermet.* XVI, 2. 88. Norden, p. 195.

88. Diod. 5, 57. On the invention of the alphabet cf. Hecat. 1, Frag. 20 J; Ephor. 70, Frag. 105 J; Skamon 476, Frag. 3 J. Cf., e.g., Pliny *HN* 5. 12. 67: *ipsa gens Phoenicum in magna gloria litterarum inventionem et siderum navaliumque ac bellicarum artium*. On Sais cf. Callisth. 124, Frag. 51 J. Ogygus founded Thebes in Egypt according to Ps. Pherecyd. 3, Frag. 178 J. The alleged birth of Horus in Troezen (Paus. 2. 30. 5), and of Karpokrates in Chalcis (on his *aretologia* now see A. J. Festugière, *HThR*, XLII [1949], 209-34) are also Greek inventions, but hardly of "pan-Hellenic" tendency.

90. Dion. Hal. *AR* 1. 31. 4. On Philoxenus (1st c. B.C.) cf. C. Wendel, s. v., *RE*, XV, 1, 196. Further cf. W. D. Woodhead, *Etymologizing in Greek Literature* (1928).

91. Dion. Hal. 7, 70; Pol. 12. 4.

92. Caes. *BG* 6. 18. 1 and 5. 12. 1ff. On the authenticity of geographical passages in Caesar see F. Beckmann, *Geographie und Ethnographie in Caesar Bellum Gallicum* (1930); P. Fabre in *Mémorial des études latines* (1943), p. 222.

93. Pol. 12. 5. 5. Cf. Diod. 5. 26.

94. Diod. 5. 21. 2. Diodorus follows Caesar's account on the origin of the Britanni.

95. Dion. Hal. 7. 70: *ὡς παρὰ τὸν ἐπιχωρίων αὐτὰς παρῆλαβον*. About the same time other Greek authors also begin to accept the Roman account. See, e.g., Strabo 5. 229; Butes *apud* Plut. *Rom.* 21. 8; Just. 43. 2; Diod. 7. 4. 5 (cf. Ed. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, II [1924], 292); Juba 275, Frag. 11 J.

96. Sall. *Iug.* 17. 7. He, probably, attacks Posidonius' view. Cf. K. Trudinger, *Studien zur Geschichte der griech.-röm. Ethnographie* (Diss., Basel, 1918), p. 197. Timagen. 88, Frag. 2 J (Amm. Marc. 15. 9. 6). Tac. *Ag.* 11: *celerrimè Britanniam qui mortales initio coluerunt indigenae an adiecti ut inter barbaros parum competentum*.

97. Cato, Frags. 42 and 54 P (Pliny *HN* 3. 130; Serv. *ad Aen.* 5. 564).

98. Sall. *Hist.* p. 60 (ed. Maurenbrecher). Add P *Ryl.* III, 471. Cf. also Bérard (*supra* n. 3), pp. 434-37.

99. Cato, Frag. 45 P (Serv. *ad Aen.* 10. 179) and Frag. 31 P.

100. Apoll. Molon., *FHG*, III, 213 (Eus. *Praep. evang.* 9. 19). The late Johanan Lewy (Jerusalem) kindly directed my attention to this and some other passages.

101. Diod. 1. 9. 3. On the value of autochthonous origin cf., e.g., Arist. *Rhet.* 1. 5; Hyperid. *Epit.* 7.

102. Jos. *Contra Ap.* 2. 152. Cf. M. Hadas, "Nationalist Survival Under Hellenistic and Roman Imperialism," *Journ. of the History of Ideas*, XI (1950), 131-40; A. Peretti, *La sivilta babilonese nella propaganda ellenistica* (1943), pp. 48-71 (on Berossus).

103. Lucan. 1. 427f.; R. Pichon, *Les sources de Lucain* (1912), pp. 31-32. Cf. Diod. 4. 17: Alesia founded by Heracles. Plin. *HN* 3. 122 (Metrodorus 184, Frag. 8 J); *puerit a Graecia Italiae rationem mutuari*. But, he adds, the sole explanation of the name of Padus (Po) which he can find, is given by Metrodorus.

104. See, e.g., Dion. Hal. *AR* 14. 1. 3; App. *Ill.* 2; Mithr. 1; Just. 42. 3. 4. Diod. 5. 80. 2: the authors on Crete disagree widely; he follows τοῖς γὰρ πιθανώτερον λέγουσι καὶ μάλιστα πιστευόμενοις.

105. Norden, p. 83. Cf. Posid. 87, Frags. 104-5 J. Celtiberians: Diod. 5. 34. Gallograeci: Norden, p. 157. Posidonius is virtually the sole Hellenistic ethnographer whose ideas are now ascertainable. The ideas of Eratosthenes on the *archaologia* are unknown, and Polybius was not interested in these questions. Cf. F. W. Walbank, "The Geography of Polybius," *CIMed*, IX (1948), 155-82.

106. On popularity of works on genealogy cf. Pol. 9. 2. 1. His words may now be illustrated by contemporary inscriptions: N. M. Condoléon, "Inscriptions de Chios," *RevPhil*, XXIII (1949), 5-16. Claudius Iullus in his *Phoiniciaca* made Heracles the founder of Acre (Acce) (*FHG*, IV, 363). It is significant that the Greek authors continued to call Germans "Celts." Cf. Norden, p. 101.

107. I do not know whether the transition from Biblical (and classical) *archaologia* to our pre-historical science has been studied and described. Virgil Polydorus was probably the first to deny the authenticity of Trojan origins of the Britons in his *Anglicae hist. libri* (1534). Cf. Ch. Firth, *Essays* (1938), p. 70; also J. Seznec, *La survivance des dieux antiques* (1940), pp. 22-25. But for Holmshed (1587) British history still begins with the rule of Samothès, the sixth son of Japhet. In 1572, to answer the charges of Las Casas against Spanish maltreatment of American Indians, P. Sarmiento wrote *Historia ... Indica* (Eng. trans., 1907), a book showing that the original inhabitants of America must have been immigrants from Atlantis, which itself had been peopled by emigrants from Spain, who descended from the Biblical Jubal, etc. Even Ulysses came to America and died in Yucatan. (Proof: the Indian vocable "Teos" for god is the same as the Greek word *theos*.) Other parts of the new continent had been settled by Greeks, Jews, etc. The latest biographer of Sarmiento does not deal with this subject. Cf. A. Carrasco, *Vida y Viajes de P. Sarmiento de Gamboa* (1946), p. 60.

108. Arist. *Meteor.* 2. 5. 15 quoted J. Paritsch, *Berichte Sachs. Ges.*, LXVIII (1916), 5. For Hecataeus cf. 1, Frag. 38 J and 1, Frag. 289-99. Cf. also Herod. 3. 106. This finality of the Greek *oikoumene* is also the reason why the "Noble Savage," known to the Greeks from Homer onward, remained a purely decorative figure in the ancient thought-world, while his discovery worked explosively on European thought. Cf. A. O. Lovejoy and G. Boas, *A Documentary History of Primitivism*, I (1935); C.-A. Julien, *Les voyages de découvertes* (1948), pp. 417-35.

109. Pliny *HN* 6. 89. Cf. the history of Greek exploration of Scythia in Rostowzew (*supra* n. 35) pp. 17-128.

110. Theopomp. 115, Frag. 75c J (= Ael. *VH* 3. 18) speaks of a continent. Seneca's "prediction" of the discovery of a New World in *Med.* 369 is well known. Cf. Norden, p. 39. J. A. O. Larsen kindly reminds me of Sen. *Quaest. nat. Praef.* 13. On Pytheas now cf. J. O. Thomson, *History of Ancient Geography* (1948), pp. 143-51.

111. Columbus' letter to Juana della Torre (Oct. 1502) quoted by Olshchki (*supra* n. 54) 4. Technical conditions of Greek navigation would make impossible a "transatlantic" voyage. According to a technician, even the Greek sail was inferior to that of the Arabs of the Middle Ages. Cf. Jean Pourjade, *La route des Indes et ses navires* (1947), as reviewed in the *Revue Histor.*, CXVII (1947), 295. John Goodwin, a friend of Milton, in his *Imputatio fidei* (1642), infers from the discovery of America that many truths "may be yet unborn." D. M. Wolfe, *Milton in the Puritan Revolution* (1941), p. 66.



# ADELARD, ARISTOTLE, AND THE *DE NATURA DEORUM*

THEODORE SILVERSTEIN

THOUGH Cicero's *De natura deorum* was not entirely unknown to the high Middle Ages, as the evidence of manuscripts and contemporary bequests indicates, first-hand uses of it by Latin writers have been so difficult to find as to suggest to some modern scholars that it remained virtually unread during that period. The present article will call attention to an important use of it in the early twelfth century by the English philosopher-scientist Adelard of Bath, and raise the question whether he knew it directly.

In Chapter 74 of his *Quaestiones naturales* Adelard is discussing the problem, often dealt with in Western tradition, whether the stars have souls; and, after an account of their corporeal composition, is led naturally to consider the movement of the heavens and its source, about which he writes:

De actione itaque earum notandum est, in quo non meam, sed Aristotelis accipe sententiam, immo quia ipsius, ideo meam: "Quidquid movetur, ait, aut natura, aut vi, aut voluntate moveri convenit. Quod autem natura movetur, aut sursum movetur, ut ignis, aut deorsum ut terra. Non autem ita moventur stellae. Non igitur moventur natura. Vi autem non moventur. Quae enim maior vis esse potest? Non igitur vi moventur. Sponte igitur voluntarieque moveri eas necesse est."<sup>1</sup>

Where did he get this quotation? Haskins, in his basic study of Adelard, has indicated its ultimate connection with Aristotle *Physics* 8.4,<sup>2</sup> and Martin Müller, Adelard's editor, with *Physics* 8.4 and 5, *De caelo* 4.3, and *Metaphysics* 11.8.<sup>3</sup> But none of these texts

contains the passage as Adelard gives it. Recognizing the problem which it poses, Müller can only suggest, "Wenn es nicht irgendwo im lateinischen Schrifttum steht, was möglich ist, so hat [Adelard] es von der Reise [i.e., im Osten] mitgebracht. Der Lehre des Stagiriten entspricht es nicht."<sup>4</sup>

Now, something very like this passage does indeed occur in a Latin piece: the *De natura deorum* 2.16, 44, in a quotation possessing the additional interest that it has hitherto been the only known citation of an Aristotle fragment belonging to a non-extant dialogue *De philosophia* and otherwise lost to us (Frag. 24 R):

Nec vero Aristoteles non laudandus in eo quod omnia quae moventur aut natura moveri censuit aut vi aut voluntate; moveri autem solem et lunam et sidera omnia; quae autem natura moverentur, haec aut pondere deorsum aut levitate in sublime ferri, quorum neutrum astris contingeret propterea quod eorum motus in orbem circumque ferretur; nec vero dici potest vi quadam maiore fieri ut contra naturam astra moventur (quae enim potest maior esse?); restat igitur ut motus astrorum sit voluntarius.<sup>5</sup>

That Cicero and Adelard are both referring to the same statement attributed to Aristotle is perfectly clear from the way the ideas in the two texts march together step by step; but their language is not quite the same. If the medieval Latin philosopher is drawing on the classical, his borrowing has, with the significant exception of a single sentence (*Quae enim maior vis esse potest?*), the character of a paraphrase,



set in syllogistic form, rather than an exact quotation, affected perhaps by another related passage in Cicero's treatise<sup>6</sup> and the memory of some further formulation elsewhere of this well-known Aristotelian doctrine which specified that it is fire which moves upward and earth down.<sup>7</sup> This raises the question whether Cicero is really Adelard's source after all, either direct or by way of some Western intermediary, or whether they are mutually independent *testimonia* to Aristotle.

Whatever date we accept for the composition of the *Quaestiones naturales* — 1111–16 or, alternatively, the fourth decade of the twelfth century<sup>8</sup> — makes little difference to our solution of this question. In either case the work reflects to an extent Adelard's contact with Greek learning in his first travels to the Middle East and his small but increasing knowledge of the Arabic traditions (somewhat greater, no doubt, if we accept the theory of later writing or revision). From either source he might have derived an acquaintance, if not with the master's texts themselves, at least with some of their contents,<sup>9</sup> including a treatment of the three kinds of movement — natural, violent, voluntary — which attributed the third kind to the stellar bodies. Thus, for example, Avicenna and Algazali, both known to the West in Latin translation or adaptation after the time with which we are concerned for Adelard, deal with *motus naturalis, violentus, and voluntarius*, and both argue, with respect to the heavens, *quod moventur voluntate*,<sup>10</sup> and: *Iam igitur manifestum est tibi quod principium motus celi non est natura. Sed iam ostensum fuerat non esse per violentiam. Igitur est per voluntatem*.<sup>11</sup> It should be observed, however, that Adelard's acquaintance with such works has, for the period of the *Quaestiones* at

least, thus far not been demonstrated, beyond the possibility predicated upon interest and opportunity.<sup>12</sup>

In any case, statements like these, though similar in principle to the quotation we are considering, are even further removed in argument and language from Adelard than is Cicero. They do not, in short, profess to quote from the work of Aristotle which the two Latin writers seem to represent.<sup>13</sup>

Such fragmentary and negative evidence as this is, of course, not enough to establish the exclusive relationship between Adelard and Cicero. Fortunately, however, there is another point to be found in the *Quaestiones* which goes far toward making that connection sure.

In the passage just preceding the quotation from Aristotle and comprising with it the nucleus of his discourse on whether the stars have souls, Adelard tells us that the celestial bodies are composed proportionately of the four elements, but *Magis ... ignea sunt quam terrestria*:

Ignis autem illarum, ut Cleanthes arguit, aut peremptorius dicendus est, ut ignis exterior aut mulcebris et innoxius, ut ignis corporis nostri interior. Atque si peremptorius esset, iam pridem suum suppositum disparasset. Ad formam etiam exterioris ignis, si talis esset, se accomodaret atque in conum surgeret. At neque suum subiectum rodit, nec in conum surgit. Non est igitur peremptorius. Est itaque mulcebris et innoxius. Sequitur ergo, ut et sensui et rationi sit obediens et obnoxius.<sup>14</sup>

For the notion of the two kinds of fire, this section is directly indebted to Plato, *Timaeus* 45 B and C, in the Chalcidian translation, some of the language of which Adelard takes over directly: *Duae sunt, opinor, uirtutes ignis, altera edax et peremptoria, altera mulcebris innoxio lumine*.<sup>15</sup> Now, in making these remarks, as it happens,

Plato (i.e., Timaeus, who is the speaker) is not at the moment interested in the nature of souls or of the heavens, but in the operation of the sense of sight. The Chalcidian commentary, however, elsewhere discusses the form of fire (*forma et figura pyramoides esse dicatur*)<sup>16</sup> and for this passage itself offers a short account of Stoic optics (*Stoici uero uidendi causam in natiui spiritus intentione constituunt, cuius effigiem conī similem uolunt, etc.*),<sup>17</sup> which together were suggestive for Adelard's statement of the difference between interior and exterior fire.<sup>18</sup>

But the clue which we are seeking resides, not there, but in the simple clause *ut Cleanthes arguit*, which Adelard has substituted in his text for Plato's (i.e., Timaeus') *opinor*. The interest of Cleanthes, Zeno's follower, in the principle of fire and the primacy of the sun in the celestial system, was known to the Latin Middle Ages from the references, among others, in Macrobius' *Saturnalia*,<sup>19</sup> but neither there nor in any of the other surviving fragments of this Stoic thinker, whether Greek or Latin, does he argue that there are two kinds of fire — with one exception: the *De natura deorum* 2.15, 40–41, which once again provides, this time for Cleanthes, what has appeared to be an unique attestation:

"ergo" inquit [i.e., Cleanthes] "cum sol igneus sit Oceanique alatur umoribus . . . necesse est aut ei similis sit igni quem adhibemus ad usum atque victum, aut ei qui corporibus animantium continetur. atqui hic noster ignis, quem usus vitae requirit, confector est et consumptor omnium idemque quocumque invasit cuncta disturbat ac dissipat; contra illa corporeus vitalis et salutaris omnia conservat alit auget sustinet sensuque adficit."<sup>20</sup>

It should be noticed, moreover, that this statement bears the same connec-

tion with Cicero's quotation of Aristotle that it does with the parallel section in Adelard — that is, it immediately precedes that quotation and furnishes with it the core of a discourse on the heavenly creatures as *animalia* and *dei*. The context is thus alike in the two authors.

This coincidence with respect to both sets of passages is too striking not to be virtually demonstrative of Adelard's debt to the *De natura deorum*. If, in the face of it, we harbor further doubt, this can only be that the borrowing is direct. Recalling Cicero's profound influence on the early fathers of the Church, we may suspect the possibility that these lines exist embedded in some older Christian text, if not somewhere in a collection of extracts. Such a text, however, has thus far not appeared in evidence and will, one may guess, be difficult to find. Christianity, of course, was ordinarily concerned with denying the pagan belief in the deity of the heavens, heeding, as it were, the injunction of Deuteronomy 4:19: *Ne forte elevatis oculis ad caelum, videas solem et lunam, et omnia astra caeli, et errore deceptus adores ea . . .* (see also *Sap.* 13:1–3). But the Ciceronian citation does not occur in such writers as Minucius Felix and Arnobius, or in Jerome, Augustine, and Ambrose, though the last two make reference to the belief itself.<sup>21</sup> Even less enlightenment of the subject is to be found in the medieval traditions of anti-pagan polemic and of hexaemeral and general scriptural commentary, which stem largely from the three earlier fathers. On the other hand, Lactantius, in attacking pagan philosophers who add to vulgar error, points to the Ciceronian context directly, even repeating the last sentence of the crucial lines (*Restat . . . ut motus astrorum sit voluntarius*), but nothing more; and without any indication of the supposed Aristotelian

provenience of the words or any reference to Cleanthes on fire.<sup>22</sup> This therefore could hardly have been the source for the English philosopher, whatever its influence in fixing the reputation of the *De natura deorum* in the Middle Ages.<sup>23</sup> Thus we are left at the moment with nothing but Cicero himself; and if Cicero in a book of extracts, then one which at the point in question preserved continuously a good-sized portion of the original from which it was drawn.

That Adelard of Bath modifies, by consideration, the traditional Christian rejection of the pagan belief that the stars are gods and move *voluntate*, is quite in keeping with the new twelfth-century spirit of humanism and science, of which his work generally furnishes one of the earliest and most striking examples. In doing so he finds the Ciceronian passages, not merely inoffensive, but the very expression of his own view. For towards the end of his treatise, in

answer to his nephew's doubt as to the true celestial nature, he writes that it should shame, not the vulgar, but *disciplinarem hominem* (that is, the educated man) to affirm the heavens to be without soul: and that, if one seeks as a god a rational, immortal animal, then accordingly the *aplanos* must be conceded to be a god.<sup>24</sup> The argument is, one observes, the perfect antithesis to that which appears in Lactantius, almost as if it had that great polemist in view. But Adelard then hastens to add a limiting stricture:

De Deo vero, a quo universalis rerum causa, incomposito, informi, immutabili, infinito si investigatur, hoc modo extimam sphaeram Deum dici abominandum est.

Thus he tempers, without destroying its edge, rational philosophic inquiry in Christian truth.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

#### NOTES

1. Ed. Martin Müller ("Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Philos. u. Theol. des Mittelalt.," XXXI. 2 [Münster, 1934]), 66-67.

2. *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science* (2d ed.; Cambridge, Mass., 1927), p. 38 and n. 89.

3. Ed. Müller, p. 88, n. 2. The reference there to *Met.* 12. 8 is an error. Cf. *De gen. et corr.* 2. 6.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 88. Franz Blümelzrieder, *Adelhard von Bath: Blätter aus dem Leben eines englischen Naturphilosophen des 12. Jahrhunderts und Bahnbrechers einer Wiedererweckung der griechischen Antike* (Munich, 1935), pp. 114-15, refers to the passage, together with a citation of Cleanthes, without considering the source, and only to illustrate Adelard's humanistic love of the Greeks. For the general question of Adelard's Aristotelianism and its sources, see Haskins, *Med. Sci.*, pp. 38-39, and n. 13 *infra*.

5. Ed. O. Plasberg (2d ed. rev. W. Ax; Leipzig, 1933), p. 65, and n. 22. See also "Appendix," p. 185, nn. 23, 26, 28, to § 65. Cf. Valentin Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 38-39; and R. Walzer, *Aristotelis dialogorum fragmenta* (Firenze, 1934), p. 85, Frag. 21. A current account of the *De philosophia*, including the present and other citations by Cicero, appears in Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, II (Paris, 1949), 219-59.

6. 2. 11. 31-32 (ed. Plasberg, pp. 60-61): *absurdum vltur . . . mundum*.

7. E.g., Macrobius, *Comment. in Somnium Scipionis*, 2. 14. 10ff., which Adelard knew. Cf. n. 13 *infra*.

8. Ed. Müller, pp. 76-77, and Haskins, *Med. Sci.*, pp. 20-27. Cf. Blümelzrieder, *Adelhard von Bath*, pp. 90ff.

9. See *supra*, n. 4, and n. 13 *infra*.

10. *Algazel's Metaphysics: A Mediaeval Translation*, ed. J. T. Muckle ("St. Michael's Mediaeval Studies," [Toronto, 1933]), p. 105.

11. Avicenna, *Metaphysica*, tract. 9, cap. 2 (*Opera* [Venice: Bonus Locatellus, 1530 (?)], f. 102<sup>v</sup>, col. 1). Cf. *De celo et mundo*, ed. 1530 (?), esp. f. 38, col. 2f.; f. 39, col. 1f.; and f. 39<sup>v</sup>, col. 2. Similar passages occur in Averroes.

12. Blümelzrieder's account of Adelard's career adds much — though some of it questionable — to our knowledge of its later stages (i. e., the *Almagest* phase), but little palpable for the *Quaestiones*; see *Adelhard von Bath*, pp. 90-117. For Adelard's other early work, the *De eodem et diverso*, he points to relations with Nemesius, *Premnon physicon*, translated by Alfano, and some coincidences with the tradition of Lucian's *Dream*; pp. 386ff. and 356ff.

13. Macrobius (see n. 7 *supra*) and Priscianus Lydus, *Solutiones ad Chosroem*, ed. I. Bywater ("Supplementum Aristotelicum," Berlin Academy ed., Vol. I. 2 [1889]), pp. 82-84, and 48f., contain some materials relevant to this topic also, though, like the *Arahs*, neither assists directly in the present instance. But their importance for the general history of Aristotelianism in the West needs to be reaffirmed. Thus, Müller (p. 20, n. 1), on Adelard's phrase, *Homo quidem rationale atque ideo sociale est*, says: "... die Bestimmung socialis hat A[delard] vielleicht im Osten kennengelernt. ζῷον πολιτικόν des Aristoteles." This notion, however, occurs in the *Comment. in Somn. Scip.* (1. 8). As for the *Solutiones ad Chosroem*, which was translated into Latin in the ninth century and was well known to Vincent of Beauvais (see Bywater, "Praefatio," pp. xi-xii), it contains large

quotations from the physical treatises of Aristotle, as well as a list of his works. Yet historians of medieval science have tended to neglect it. Haskins (*Med. Sci.*, p. 368) says of Alexander Neckam's *Sacerdos ad altare* (late 12th or early 13th century) that it "contains one of the earliest mentions of the *Metaphysics* and the *De generatione* in Latin Europe." But the *Solutiones* had already named the *De gen.* three centuries earlier: "ex Platonico enim Timaeo ... et aliis disputationibus assumpta atque confecta sunt, et actionibus Aristotelis de *Physica* et de *Caeli generatione* et corruptione et *Meteorogon*; similiter quoque et ex his quae sunt de Somno et somniis, et ex his quae quasi in dialogis scripta sunt de Philosophia et de *Mundis*" (ed. Bywater, "Prooemium," pp. 41-42).

14. Ed. Müller, p. 66. For the non-Aristotelian view, occurring frequently among Christian writers, that the celestial bodies are composed of the four elements, see Adelard's contemporary Guillaume de Conches (*Element. philos.*, bk. 3, ed. Migne, *PL* XC, 1161 B): "Praedocumimus enim corpora stellarum ex quatuor elementis facta, dominante tamen igne."

15. Ed. Wrobel (Leipzig, 1876), p. 52.

16. § 20 (ed. Wrobel, p. 85).

17. § 237 (ed. Wrobel, p. 272).

18. P. 66: "Ad formam etiam exterioris ignis, si talis esset, se accomodaret atque in conum surgeret. At neque suum subiectum rodit, nec in conum surgit. Non est igitur peremptorius..." Adelard's argument that the cone does not have actual extension also reflects an implication of the Chalcidian passage, where sight is said (according to Heraclitus) to involve *intimum motum* and the cone is treated in terms of the mathematics of the science of optics. Cf. *Timaeus* 45 B-46 C. There is no evidence here that he knew anything of that *Licht-metaphysik* which, developed from Greek sources especially by Arabs and Jews, appeared later in such Western philosophers as Witelo and Pseudo-Grosseteste. Nor is it clear whether and how far he was also influenced, during the period in question, by the ancient treatises on optics. The conoid shape of the image occurs in Diogenes Laertius, ascribed there to the Stoics, as well as in Ptolemy's work on the subject; and both were known in Sicily, where Adelard had travelled perhaps as early as the first decade of the century. But the only sure dates of such knowledge, deducible from the surviving translations and the careers of their translators, are too late for

the *Quaestiones naturales*, as is true also of the Latin version of Euclid's *Optics*, formerly ascribed to Adelard, but without adequate evidence. See Haskins, *Med. Sci.*, pp. 33, 143, 166, and 179, n. 102.

19. E.g., I. 17, 8, 31, 36.

20. Ed. Plasberg, p. 64. For this and other remnants of Cleanthes, see von Arnim, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, I (Leipzig, 1905), 110-24, and esp. Frag. 504, p. 113; A. C. Pearson, *The Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes* (London, 1891), esp. Frag. 30, and the references there to Zeno, Frag. 71, pp. 259-60 and 125-26; and N. Festa, *I frammenti degli stoici antichi*, II (Bari, 1935), 125-26, Frag. 4. Cf. Festa, I (1932), 87, Frag. 18.

21. E.g., Augustine, *Contra Priscell. et Origen.* 8. 11 (Migne, *XLII*, 675); and Ambrose, *Hexaem.* 2. 4. 17 (Migne, *XIV*, 155-56).

22. *Divin. instit.* 2. 5 (Migne, *VI*, 278). Firmicus Maternus, *De errore profanarum religionum*, which records a considerable body of pagan beliefs, also shows the influence of the *De nat. deor.* and rejects its views. But it does not use the passages in question and, in any case, could not easily have been known in the Middle Ages, as the history of its survival suggests: see ed. Konrat Ziegler (Leipzig, 1907), p. 35, n. 4; p. 41, nn. 5, 6, 18; and pp. ix ff.

23. That this reputation continued at least doubtful at the other end of the century from Adelard is apparent in Alexander Neckam's remark, which, however, also has the implication that disapproval was far from uniform: *Liber inscriptus de multitudine deorum a quibusdam reprobatur* (Haskins, *Med. Sci.*, p. 372). John of Salisbury's citations of the work, as appears from Webb's editions of the *Policraticus* and the *Metalogicon*, are both few and insignificant.

24. Cap. 76, ed. Müller, p. 68. Cf. *De eodem et diverso*, ed. H. Willner ("Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Philos. d. Mittelalt.," IV, 1 (1903)), p. 32, on the divinity of the *superiora animalia*. For the strange form of ἀπλάνης, cf., e.g., Papias, ed. Mombrilius (Milan: Domenico de Vespole, 1476), and Giovanni Balbi, *Catholicon*, ed. Petrus Egidius (Leyden: Anton du Ry, 1520), s. v. "aplanos." Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II (New York, 1923), 41, in a paraphrase of this passage, gives the form *aplanon*, but Adelard actually writes *aplanos dico*. Cf. Milo, *De mundi philosophia*, Ms. Douai Bibl. munic. 749, f. 94<sup>v</sup>, col. 2: "Mobilis est aplanos centrum quia pendet in imo...."

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### GENUINE TRADITION AND LATE MANUSCRIPTS

In his recent and valuable book, *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee* (Munich, 1951), Reinhold Merkelbach reports<sup>1</sup> an interesting observation of Jachmann's in connection with the problem of "echte Tradition in jungen Handschriften." In *Iliad* 11. 814 the reading of Ω is Μενoitίου ἄλκιμος υἱός, but in W<sup>3</sup> (s. xiii-xiv) a second hand has noted a variant ἄγλαός which is found in the text of M<sup>12</sup> (s. xv) and of P<sup>8</sup> (s. xv-xvi). What lends interest to all this is that the Geneva Ptolemaic papyrus (P5[2a]) reads ἄγλαός. At first sight so odd a coincidence impels one to seek an explanation.

Just what happened between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries cannot be seen clearly until we are better informed about the classification of the manuscripts.<sup>2</sup> Fortunately, it is not important at the moment. There cannot be a direct connection between the medieval group and the papyrus, or we would have more evidence of it.<sup>3</sup> We are therefore compelled to look for some more roundabout connection.

As a first step, one must make an assumption which may not seem too improbable: a number of P5's contemporaries also read ἄγλαός. If so, then one of two things may have happened. (1) Contamination of such texts may have taken place with forerunners of Ω, and hybrids bred in this way may have left their mark on the manuscripts that now read ἄγλαός. Or (2) the ἄγλαός reading may have been connected with some big name, for instance Zenodotus or the Chia. Then someone, Didymus, let us say, made a record of the fact. A scholium based upon this record and now lost without trace lasted long enough to reach W<sup>3</sup> (or one of its forbears) and start the ἄγλαός variants.

Instead of making a choice, I turn to another problem — the value of this variant. The question concerns some of the "numerosae formulae di valore ritmico ugu-

ale, che per il senso non differiscono o differiscono soltanto per una sfumatura."<sup>4</sup>

Bechtel notes<sup>5</sup> that ἄγλαός is used chiefly in formulas, and the same is true of ἄλκιμος. Here only forms of the nominative or accusative masculine singular need to be considered, and some of these as non-formulaic can be set aside: πόρην δέ οἱ ἄγλαὸν υἱὸν / Εὐδωρον *Il.* 16. 185; ὅς τ' ἄλκιμος ἐξεφαάνθη *Il.* 13. 278; οὐτ' ἄλκιμος ὡς σὺ μάχεσθαι *Il.* 15. 570; ὅς τε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἄνδρα φοβεῖ *Il.* 17. 177 = *Il.* 16. [689]. The following formulas, which except at *Iliad* 23. 302 stand always at the end of a verse, are left:

Εὐαίμονος ἄγλαός υἱός *Il.* 2. 736, 5. 79, 7. 167, 8. 265, 11. 575.

Λυκάονος ἄγλαός υἱός *Il.* 2. 826, 5. 95, 101, 179, 229, 276, 283.

Νέστορος ἄγλαός υἱός *Il.* 10. 196, 23.

302; Ὀχρησίου ἄγλαὸν υἱὸν *Il.* 5. 843;

Πεισήνορος ἄγλαὸν υἱὸν *Il.* 15. 445;

Ἀντήνορος ἄγλαὸν υἱὸν *Il.* 15. 517; Καπανθίος ἄγλαός υἱός *Il.* 5. 241.

Μενoitίου ἄλκιμος υἱός *Il.* 11. 605, 814,

837, 12. 1, 16. 307, 626, 665, 18. 12;

Μενoitίου ἄλκιμον υἱὸν *Il.* 16. 278, 827, 19. 24, 18. [455].

Διώρεος ἄλκιμος υἱός *Il.* 17. 429; Φυλῆος

ἄλκιμον υἱὸν *Il.* 10. 110; Τυδέος ἄλκιμον υἱὸν *Il.* 6. [437].

A variation Τελαμώνιος ἄλκιμος Αἴας *Il.* 12. 349, 362.

Such is the story told by Ω, without a trace in any other passage of an interchange of ἄγλαός and ἄλκιμος except for one scholium which I shall mention later.

In the face of this, what is to be done with the papyrus variant? Unfortunately, we do not know what the papyrus read elsewhere; it is mutilated at *Iliad* 11. 837, 12. 1, and does not extend to any other occurrence of the formula. It is, of course, possible to assume that it read ἄγλαός everywhere, and on the basis of its (as-



sumed) authority to put ἀγλαός everywhere into our text. I should not care to do so, and I do not think anyone else would.

Should ἀγλαός be read in *Iliad* 11. 814 alone? A poet could call one of his heroes either ἀγλαός or ἄλκιμος; but after he had used one, he stuck to it throughout: Eurypylos is always Εὐαίμονος ἀγλαός υἱός (5 times), Pandaros always Λυκάονος ἀγλαός υἱός (7 times), Patroklos always Μενοιτιάδης ἄλκιμος υἱός (11 times), and neither phrase is given to any other hero oftener than once.<sup>6</sup> That is the sort of thing — the use of fixed formulas — that we have come to expect in oral composition. I am unwilling to break the formula by following the papyrus.

Then nothing is left but to believe that the papyrus has blundered. Is that likely? Down to and including *Iliad* 11. 575, ἀγλαός υἱός has been written 15 times, ἄλκιμος υἱός once, *Iliad* 10. 110.<sup>7</sup> A carry-over of ἀγλαός υἱός into *Iliad* 11. 814 seems quite probable. One may compare the similar way in which, with much less temptation, ἐπεὶ πῖεν αἶμα κελαινόν made its way in very many MSS from *Odyssey* 11. 98 into *Odyssey* 11. 390 — GXDT (Ludwich) remaining unaffected and keeping ἐπεὶ ἶδεν ὄφθαλμοῖσι. Wilamowitz<sup>8</sup> and Schwartz<sup>9</sup> saw what had happened; and Von der Mühl has wisely printed ἐπεὶ ἶδεν ὄφθαλμοῖσι in his text.<sup>10</sup> In *Iliad* 11. 814 the papyrus has written what it expected to find, being guided by memory more than by eyesight. "Ἄλκιμος in *Iliad* 11. 605 might be expected to break the chain of memory, but apparently did not. Perhaps the entrance of Eurypylos Εὐαίμονος ἀγλαός υἱός served to strengthen at this point the memory of ἀγλαός.

There is also something more than a possibility that *Iliad* 11. 605 was never seen by the writer of the papyrus. Lachmann indicated briefly<sup>11</sup> that the original text may have been:

602 αἶψα δ' ἐταῖρον ἐὼν Πατροκλῆα προσέειπεν  
603 φθεγξάμενος παρὰ νηός· ὃ δὲ κλισίῃθεν  
ἀκούσας

604 ἔκμολεν ἕσσος Ἄρτη, κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ  
πέλεν ἀρχή·

608 " δῖε Μενoitιᾶδῃ, κτλ.

Examination of the material collected in my article "On the Interpolation of Certain Homeric Formulas," *Class. Phil.*, XVII (1922), 213–21, will show that this text conforms to a Homeric pattern and one that is at times extended by an interpolation that brings a verb of speaking (προσέφη *Iliad* 11. 607) into the line immediately before the speech. Leaf names no names but argues against a suggestion (thoroughly bad, I should say) that lines 603–4 also are not original. One good point, however, emerges: one-line speeches like *Iliad* 11. 606 are rare in Homer — no example in the *Iliad* until *Iliad* 18. 182. We might expect such a fluctuation in the tradition to be mentioned in the scholia — for instance, the "three lines were athetized by Aristophanes and Aristarchus, not written by Zenodotus." The loss of such a note should, however, not surprise us.<sup>12</sup>

This is merely a digression. If Lachmann is wrong, the probability that the papyrus reading is a blunder due to a too active memory is nevertheless sufficiently strong. It is strengthened more than is necessary, if Lachmann is right.

I turn now to the later disturbance. Conditions — except that *Iliad* 11. 605 was certainly present — were the same, and it is no occasion for surprise that a man (or men) should have made the same reaction. Elsewhere we can see them slipping into accustomed grooves: P60 (3/4 p.) writes Τελαμώνιος ἄλκιμος υἱός in *Iliad* 12. 349, 362, D does the same in 349, P<sup>12</sup> in 362. Vi<sup>2</sup> writes in both places Τελαμώνιος Αἴας in spite of the meter, and P<sup>12</sup> does the same in 349, where Vi<sup>6</sup> did the same and then added ἄλκιμος, a later hand indicating the correct order.<sup>13</sup>

Blundering of this sort seems a sufficient explanation of the variants at *Iliad* 11. 814, but I shall mention — for whatever it is worth — another possibility. At *Iliad* 19. 24 the BT scholia are troubled by the formulaic epithet. B defends ἄλκιμον: τὸν τότε, οὐ τὸν νῦν· ἀρμόζει δὲ τῇ συμπαθείᾳ ἢ τῆς ἀλκῆς ὑπόμνησις. T simply reports and interprets an emendation: τινὲς "ἀγ-



λαὸν υἱόν," ἵνα ἀρμόζῃ τῇ αἰκίᾳ ἢ ὑπόμνησις τοῦ κάλλους. Ludwig<sup>14</sup> marks the latter to show that he does not believe that such stuff goes back to Didymus. It is indeed a piece of the non-Alexandrian aesthetic exegesis that is characteristic of the BT scholia. A man with this before him — and there would be many of the sort — might be inspired to emulation. He would then emend on the ground that mention of Patroklos' beauty and not of his valor would be more suitable when he is about to perform a work of mercy for the benefit of Εὐαίμονος ἀγλαὸς υἱός.

The other example taken from Jachmann is *Odyssey* 20. 55 which Ω presents as: αὐτὴ δ' ἄψ ἐς Ὀλυμπον ἀρίκετο δια θεάων. However, U (Mon. Aug. 519<sup>B</sup>, s. xiv) reads ἀπέστιγε with ἀρίκετο written above it.

I may begin by noting that this passage and *Iliad* 11. 814 are very different. Here we have simply an exchange of synonyms, and the question is, which was most probably the reading of B?<sup>15</sup>

It now seems strange — hindsight is always easy — that no one appreciated the intrinsic merit of the variant. However, the publication in 1906 of P19(3a) that read ἀπέστιγε threw much weight into the scales.<sup>16</sup> Monro and Allen<sup>3</sup> (1920) still held to ἀρίκετο in the text, but added the valuable fact that ἀπέστιγε is read by some manuscripts<sup>17</sup> in *Iliad* 15. 572 — a variant worthy of much consideration. Schwartz<sup>18</sup> unhesitatingly pronounced ἀπέστιγε better than "das triviale ἀρίκετο"; Wilamowitz<sup>19</sup> expressed his agreement, and ἀπέστιγε now stands in the text of Von der Mühl.

The papyrus testifies to the presence in the third century B.C. of ἀπέστιγε, and ἀρίκετο must have been in competition with it, for otherwise there would be no problem. Which of the competitors was preferred by the publisher(s) of the Alpha Text ca. 150 B.C. remains unknown. Fortunately, it is not important, since, whichever it was, some of the workmen would have written the other, for reasons explained in my book *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad* (Baltimore, 1944), pp. 22-23. Consequently, the competition would be going on at the beginning of our era.

The outcome is not difficult to foresee. (Ἀφ)ικέσθαι is frequent in Homer and familiar in later times; (ἀπο)στείχειν is infrequent in Homer, imitated in Lyric and Tragic poetry, and found in some Aeolic inscriptions.<sup>20</sup> The only question is how long it will take ἀρίκετο to eliminate its competitor here by lateral diffusion, and in the fourteenth century we see it overrunning the last survivor.

In conclusion, I may note that both examples touch not whole lines but words within them, and may recall<sup>21</sup> the need of keeping the two questions apart. The very interesting examples of the sort given by Professor Jachmann should give no encouragement to the insertion of lines so badly attested as, for example, *Iliad* 2. 558 or *Odyssey* 9. 531, nor to a belief that even so odd a combination of evidence as are the *testimonia* for ἀγλαός: ἄλκιμος must lead to the original text.

G. M. BOLLING

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

#### NOTE S

1. Page 238, an addendum to p. 183 n.
2. Allen's collations furnish materials for a classification, but the work remains to be done. Compare G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Firenze, 1934), p. 209; also p. 208.
3. Allen, *Prolegomena*, p. 60, sums up: "There are no real connexions," between P5 and later texts "for the variants 796 and 830 are both due to contamination or reminiscence."
4. Pasquali, *op. cit.* (cf. note 2 above), p. 201.
5. *Lexilogus zu Homer* (Halle a. d. S., 1914), p. 8.
6. Νέστορος ἀγλαός υἱός means Thrasydes in *Il.* 10, Antilochos in *Il.* 23.
7. Interpolations are treated as non-existent.

8. *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1884), p. 151, n. 11.
9. *Die Odyssee* (Munich, 1924), p. 147, n. 1.
10. That Merkelbach, p. 190, n. 2, differs seems regrettable; an argument from the silence of scholia is not convincing.
11. *Betrachtungen über Homers Ilias; mit Zusätzen von Moriz Haupt*. 3. Aufl. (Berlin, 1874), p. 81.
12. Cf. note 10 above.
13. Allen reports only the readings of P60 and D; for the others I depend on Leaf and Ludwig.
14. *Aristarchs homerische Textkritik* (Leipzig, 1884), I, 441.
15. The current term for a manuscript written in

Athens ca. 550 B.C., on which all our information about the *Odyssey* depends.

16. I regret that I myself — thanks to a too-active memory — gave ἀπόκρυφο as the reading of the papyrus in *External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford, 1925), p. 251.

17. Leaf knew but two MSS, Ludwig four, that read ἀπόκρυφο; in his major edition Allen reports it as the reading of O<sup>a</sup> P<sup>a</sup> P<sup>b</sup> U<sup>a</sup> V<sup>a</sup> V<sup>b</sup> V<sup>c</sup> V<sup>d</sup> V<sup>e</sup> V<sup>f</sup> V<sup>g</sup> V<sup>h</sup> V<sup>i</sup>.

18. *Die Odyssee* (Munich, 1924), p. 329. His edition is inaccessible to me.

19. *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus* (Berlin, 1925), p. 89, n.

20. The distribution is curious. In spite of its IE background and its survival in Aeolic, the word is found only once in (roughly) 2600 lines of the *Iliad* (1. 522, 2. 287, 833, 9. 86, 11. 331, 16. 258 — all from later strata); but once in 1000 lines of the *Odyssey* (4. 277, 7. 72, 9. 418, 444, 11. 17, 132, 12. 143, 333, 17. 204, 20. 73, 23. 136, 279).

21. Cf. *Athetized Lines*, p. 8.

# PUBLILIUS MEMORIALIS AND *CIL*, XI, 7554 (= DESSAU, 9195)

[P]VBLILIO·L·F·F A[B or L]

MEMORIALI

[P]RAEF·FABR·PRAEF·COH·III

[C]YRENEICAE·SAGITTARIOR

5 [TR]IB·MILIT·LEG·X·FRETENSIS

[PRA]EF·GENTIS·NVMIDAR·DILICTAT (*sic*)

[TIR]ONVM·EX·NVMIDIA·LECTO[R

8 ]AVG·IN·AFRICA·ITEM·N[

9 ]E·ITEM·FERRAR[

D. Vaglieri originally published this inscription (from Bracciano, ancient Forum Clodi) in *NS*, 1895, p. 342, restoring the first seven lines as indicated above. Of these there can be no doubt. At the end of line 8, however, he read not N but only the upright of an unknown letter, and in line 9 he read the last letter as T. This led him to complete the last 2 lines: "[leg(ionum)] Aug(ustae) in Africa, item ... / ... [a]e, item Ferrat[ae]."<sup>1</sup> This completion has been accepted and repeated wherever we have been able to find the inscription quoted in full<sup>2</sup> except for "[leg(ionum)]": only Passerini has this, Liebenam having "[leg(ionibus) III]." Cagnat and Dessau only "[leg.]" and *CIL* "[leg(ionis)]." Publius Memorialis has been identified with a procurator in Corsica under Vespasian (*CIL*, X, 8038).<sup>3</sup> Certainly this is plausible, and we see no arguments against it; no other Publius Memorialis has come to light, so far as we can discover.

Vaglieri's completion, if correct, is a little surprising in view of the absence of numbers for the legions supposedly named. It is distinctly uncommon for a legion to be named without its number (note that the number is duly present in line 5 of our inscription): in Dessau's indexes there are three examples (of a popular, unofficial

character),<sup>4</sup> and Ritterling's long account of the individual legions under the Empire confirms the rarity of the practice.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, as one reads the stone, one seems to expect a full stop after "lecto(rum)"; no other examples of *dilectatores* (see De Ruggerio, *RE*, *Thesaurus*) offer any parallels that would support Vaglieri's reconstruction by mention of specific legions.

We are sure that Vaglieri misread the ends of lines 8 and 9. The squeeze of the stone that we made in 1949 at the Museo Nazionale in Rome, where the stone is, clearly shows the upper left corner of an N at the end of line 8: the beginning of the angle there can fit no other letter. The complete upright is not extant — only the top of it with just the beginning of the diagonal. Of the last letter extant in line 9 there is only the merest fraction of the top (the letters RRA preceding it are also only partially preserved but are unmistakable). After a very careful study of our squeeze we find it necessary to reject Vaglieri's T here, partly because of spacing (if the remains were of the left side of a T crossbar, they would be a little nearer the top of the A, we think), partly because the extant serif slants in the wrong direction for that of the left side of a T crossbar, and partly because there is a suggestion of the be-

ginning of an upright just below the serif and where, if the letter were a T, there would be nothing. If T is rejected, what is possible? Immediately *ferrariarum* comes to mind, and if the same tests are applied as to Vaglieri's T, it is seen that the letter R as the final one of the line fits perfectly: the spacing and the direction of the serif are right, and R has its upright in the right place.

If the correct reading is FERRAR[ARVM], as we feel certain, Publius Memorialis must have been *procurator ferrariarum*, a title well-known in inscriptions. The beginning of line 8 must have read: PROC·AVG·IN·AFRICA, which is perfectly satisfactory spatially. We have been unable to find any other procurators with duties in Africa whose title is expressed precisely thus, but two inscriptions mentioning other provinces in this way may be noted:

1. NS, 1902, p. 124 = Dessau, 9007 (Augustan): Q. Octavius L. f., C. n., T. pron., Ser., Sagitta, Tivir quinq. III, praef. fab., prae. equi., trib. mil. a populo, procurator Caesaris Augusti in Vindaliis et Raetis et in valle Poenina per annos IIII, in Hispania provincia per annos X, et in Suria bien-nium.<sup>6</sup>
2. CIL, V, 1838 f. = Dessau, 1349 (Claudian): C. Baebio P. f. Cla. Attico, Tivir i. [d.], primopil. leg. V Macedonic., praef. c[i]vitatium Moesiae et Treballia[e], praef. [c]iuitat. in Alpib. Maritumis, t[r.] mil. coh. VIII pr., primopil. iter., procurator Ti. Claudi Caesaris Aug. Germanici in Norico,<sup>7</sup> civitas Saevatum et Laianeorum.

Note the preparation for their procuratorships of these two men of equestrian rank, which suggests that the natural thing to expect in the incomplete lines of our inscription is a listing of Publius's procuratorships.<sup>8</sup>

What then of the end of line 8 and the beginning of line 9? First it must be stated that, if our Publius Memorialis is the man mentioned by Vespasian in CIL, X, 8038 (above, p. 90), we cannot seek help for the restoration by comparison of provincial rank and stipends as found under Hadrian

and later, when the hierarchy for these posts had become more stabilized. Even then, apparently, there were exceptions, and in the period of the development of the imperial service there is no evidence of a regular progression or *cursus honorum*, though the trend was always toward more systemization.<sup>9</sup>

Several possibilities occur to us for the completion of the last two lines, but we offer none of them as more than a mere possibility: ITEM·N[ORICAE] (or even ITEM·N[ARBON.] / PROVINCIA]E (see Dessau 9007 above for an example of the unexpected reverse order: "in Hispania provincia"); or ITEM·N[ORICI] / ITEM·ACHAIA]E, Achaia coming to mind because of a stone from Corinth of the Trajanic period published by Oscar Broneer in AJA, XXXVII (1933), 567 f. (Pl. LXIII, 1), concerning C. Caelius Martialis, an equestrian, whose two procuratorships were *proc. provinc. Achaiae* and then *proc. ferrari[arum]*.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps we should also consider: ITEM·N[ORICI] / ET (or ITEM)·RAETIA]E. Other provinces for the beginning of line 9 can doubtless be thought of, and it would be pleasant to suppose that it read: ITEM·CORSICA]E, thus confirming the identification with Vespasian's man, but this would extend the line a little farther left than appears likely and illustrates well the futility of attempting to restore where there is no evidence. However, the change from IN AFRICA to the genitive seems indicated by the lack of repetition of IN in line 8 and by the first E in line 9. Perhaps PROC·]AVG·IN·AFRICA·ITEM·N[ORICO] / [PROC·... A]E is worth considering, though we have found no other examples with *in* omitted in repetition. Nor have we found any parallels for the change from ablative phrase to genitive without repetition of *procurator*, but the ablative phrase is not common. Except for the two examples quoted, we find it only as part of longer titles, e.g., *proc. Aug. ad accipiendus (sic) census in provinc. Gallia Lugudunenensi (sic) et in provincia Thracia* (CIL, XIV, 4250 = Dessau, 1391), *proc. Aug. ad bona co[ge]nda*

in Africa and proc. in Aegypto ad epistategiam [s]eptem nomorum et Arsinoitum (CIL, III, 7127 = Dessau, 1421); the construction in CIL, VIII, 11174 = Dessau, 1440 is specially interesting: ... *procuratori centenario regionis Hadrimetiinae, fun[c]to etiam partibus ducenari ex sacro praecepto in eadem regione*. Examples omitting the word *provincia* and examples omitting repetition of *procurator* may be found. A few examples in addition to Dessau, 9007, already quoted (above, p. 91), are: Dessau, 1338 (proc. Aug. Armeniae mai[oris], ludi magni, hereditatium et a censibus, a libellis Aug.), 1363 (proc. Aug. .... item .. Norici, Raetiae Vindelic[ae], Maur[etaniae] Caesar.), 1364 (proc. Aug. prov. Daciae superior., proc. provinc. Cappadoc. item Ponti mediterr. et Ar[men]iae minor. et Lycaon. An[tioch]ian., proc. prov. Raetiae), 1386 (procurator Augg. rationis hereditatium, item provinciae Narbonensis), and 9019 (proc. XL Galliarum et portus, item argentariarum Pannonicarum).<sup>11</sup>

As for the end of line 9, we cannot know, of course, whether *ferrariarum* was abbreviated or written in full; whether anything followed it in the line is dependent on this and — since each line throughout seems to have been pretty well centered — on the number of letters restored at the beginning of the line. *Ferrariarum* in full, with nothing after it, and a restoration of about 8–9 letters at the beginning of the line would be most satisfactory spatially.

We should print lines 8 and 9, therefore:

[PROC]AVG-IN-AFRICA-ITEM-N[  
]E-ITEM-FERRAR[IA]RVM[  
] or FERRAR[ia]rum) ...

Finally a word on the significance of the

corrected readings: the awkwardness felt in Vaglieri's restoration has now disappeared, and though we cannot supply the end of line 8 with certainty the new N allows positive and directed speculation; we are also provided with additional offices such as we might expect for our Publilius Memorialis. If he is Vespasian's man, as appears likely, we get also a fairly early example of *procurator ferrariarum* and of the performance of this work by men of equestrian rank with considerable military background and experience; and we may have in the IN AFRICA further evidence of the evolution of the title *procurator Augusti*. Unfortunately our inscription neither defines the term "Africa" (the province? or a loose usage for a larger area, or a part of it?) nor describes the nature of our man's duties (financial? or primarily military or administrative?), and so where it fits in the imperial administration of Africa is not clear: it must be left to the experts in this field to determine what, if anything, it contributes in this respect. Because it is not positively datable, despite the probability that it belongs under Vespasian, it is valueless, we think, as evidence for the hierarchy of procuratorships or even for the progression toward such hierarchy. But now it is no longer possible to identify recruits from Numidia with specific legions or to say, as Passerini does (*loc. cit.*, above, note 2), that here we have one example of a *dilectator* or *dilectus* named in relation to particular legions. We no longer do.

JOYCE S. AND ARTHUR E. GORDON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

#### NOTES

1. In his article FERRATA in De Ruggiero (III 2 [1897], 59, col. 1 *fin.*) Vaglieri suggests "[De]otarianae?" for the second legion.

2. Liebenam, *RE*, V (1905), 619, 38–42, s. v. "Dilectus"; René Cagnat, *L'Armée romaine d'Afrique* ... I (Paris, 1912), 37 note 2, 263; Dessau, III 2 (1916), 9195 (I do not find it in the Indices, III 1, pp. 446–61, "Legiones"); Bormann, *CIL*, XI 2, 2 (1926), 7554; A. Passerini, in De Ruggiero, IV 20 (1950), p. 610, col. 2, s. v. "LEGIO."

3. E. g., by Vaglieri, *NS*, 1895, p. 343; Dessau, 9195, note 2; *CIL*, XI, 7554, note; but *PIR*, III<sup>1</sup>, though dated 1898, does not have our Publilius, p. 107, No. 784.

4. Dessau, III 1, p. 461: *λεγεὼν Ἀλβανῶν* (II Parthica), leg(io) Daciae (XIII Gemina), and legio M(o)esiaca. On the first, cf. Ritterling, *RE*, XII 2 (1925), 1477, ll. 10–14, 1483, ll. 25–61; we do not find the other two examples cited or explained.

5. Ritterling, *op. cit.*, 1376–1829, s. v. "Legio."

6. As corrected by N. Persichetti di S. Mustiola, *Röm. Mitt. = Bull. Ist.*, XXVII (1912), 304, No. 15. Stein in *RE*, XVII 2 (1937), 1855, 22–26, s. v. Octavius, No. 85, describes his position in the district indicated by "in Vindal. et Raetis et in valle Poen." as having been more probably that of *praefectus*; that is, Stein

seems to mean that it would have been more correct or usual to call Octavius *praefectus*, since (he seems to think) he was actually governor. In this he followed A. von Domaszewski, who used the support of *CIL*, IX, 3044 (= Dessau, 2689), in which Sex. Pedius Lusianus Hirritus is called "[praefectus] Raetis Vindoliciis vall[is] Poeninae et levis armatur[ae]." A. N. Sherwin-White, in his article *Procurator Augusti* (*PBSR*, XV = n. s. II [1939], 11-26), 13, 15, disagrees: procurator here "at first sight appears to" indicate "a governorship"; "probably Sagitta was agent in this area when Raetia was ... governed by a *legatus Augusti*"; "Sagitta ... was probably ... always a financial officer ...." O. Hirschfeld's view, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten* ...<sup>2</sup> (Berlin, 1905), p. 383, note 5, that the construction with *in* here is due to the statement of the duration of the work in each district seems unfounded.

7. Not a financial officer but a governor: see Sherwin-White, *op. cit.*, p. 15. On the use of *in Norico* here, see Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 382f., who feels that the title perhaps developed from an earlier "praefectus civitatum in Norico." For a different view of the ablative phrase, see E. Polaschek, *RE*, XVII 1 (1936), 988, 3-25, *s. v.* "Noricum." In *CIL*, VI, 31032 = Dessau, 1418, corrected from *CIL*, VI, 3720, we have a "praef. gentium in Africa" (Ti. Claudius Pollio, a "fellow-soldier" of the younger Pliny's [*Ep.* 7.31], "postea promotus ad amplissimas procuraciones," sec. 3: the inscription, record-

ing a dedication by himself, mentions two, "proc. Aug. XX hereditatum" and "proc. Alpium Graiarum": Stein, *PIR*, II<sup>2</sup> [1936], C 966, p. 233), but note that Publius had already been "praef. gentis Numidarum."

8. For a general treatment of the procuratorial career of an equestrian, see Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 410-65. The origin of the imperial civil service and its development down to Vespasian are the subject of Sherwin-White's article, *op. cit.*

9. See Sherwin-White, *op. cit.*

10. Stein, *PIR*, II<sup>2</sup>, C 136, p. 26. For a probably late-Augustan *proc. Caesaris Aug. prov. Achaiae*, P. Caninius Agrippa, see L. R. Dean, *AJA*, ser. 2, XXIII (1919), 171f., nos. 13f.; A. B. West, *Corinth* ..., VIII 2 (1931), Nos. 65f., pp. 45f.; Stein, *op. cit.*, C 387, p. 92.

11. The dates are: 1338, probably Hadrianic; 1363, under Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius (Stein, *PIR*, I<sup>2</sup> [1933], B 36, p. 349); 1364, *proc. prov. Raetiae* in 166; 1386, probably between 177 and 180 (*idem*, *RE*, XIX 1 [1937], 1222f., *s. v.* "Petronius" No. 67); 9019, also second century (so at least the original editor dated the lettering — N. Vulli, *Jahresh. des österr. arch. Inst. in Wien*, VIII [1905], Beiblatt, cols. 3f., No. 8; "under Marcus Aurelius," S. J. de Laet, *Portorium, Étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains* ... [Brugge, 1949, Rijksuniv. te Gent, Werken uitg. door de fac. van de wijsb. en letteren, 105], pp. 134 [cf. p. 131], 386, 390, 404).

### FRUSTUM PORCINUM

Several times Plautus<sup>1</sup> and Martial<sup>2</sup> refer to pork *glandia* or *glandulae* as choice bits of meat; Pliny the Elder<sup>3</sup> includes them among the viands banned by the censors.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps this tidbit can be somewhat more accurately identified than is done in Harper's *Dictionary*, Forcellini, or the *Thesaurus*.

The name, of course, suggests some kind of nodule or kernel; this is borne out by Pliny,<sup>5</sup> who notes a resemblance between *glandia* of flesh and the burls (*tubera*) in timber.

When we consider pork, we are told by modern experts that such burls occur in three (or four) places.<sup>6</sup>

One is found at the junction of ham and abdomen; this is regarded as worthless by the modern butcher and is discarded. It is thus probably ruled out of the picture.

The next are the kidneys, which Friedländer hesitatingly suggests in his note on Martial. These of course are edible; but they are put out of consideration because Pliny<sup>7</sup> and Columella<sup>8</sup> definitely associate the *glandia* with the neck.

A third possible set are the salivary glands, again out of consideration because they are associated with the jowls and tongue rather than with the neck.

In this cervical region the veterinary experts tell us that there are four nodule-like bits: the parathyroid, the cervical lymph, the thyroid, and the thymus glands.<sup>9</sup>

Of these, according to Dr. Latimer, the parathyroid is like a pea in size and shape, the cervical lymph gland is about like a cherry or smaller; he regards neither as a possible delicacy. The other two are more noticeable in size. The thyroid gland is not rated highly; and practical tests of frying show it edible but rather tough. Perhaps it would be more tender when boiled. The thymus gland, or "sweetbread," turned out by experiment to be really good. Although all four are regarded nowadays as too small to be worth marketing, the size of the thyroid and thymus glands of the adult hog, measuring in the samples given me about 1½ to 3 inches in length by ¾ to 1¼ inches in thickness, makes them come within the picture.



One can not tell how far the Roman would go in his choice; he might possibly include the first two, in spite of the fact that they do not amount to much in size or taste; he would be more likely to use the thyroid gland, although it is not first class;

but in any case I would regard the thymus gland, or "sweetbread," as a certainty.

O. J. TODD

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

#### NOTES

1. *Capt.* 915: *arripuit gladium, praetruncavit tribus tegoribus glandia*
- Curc.* 323: *pernam, abdomen, sumen suis (sueris?), glandium*
- Ibid.*, 366: *pernam, sumen, glandium*
- Men.* 210f: *glandionidam suillam, laridum pernonidam, aut sincipitamenta porcina*
- Pseud.* 166: *pernam, callum, glandium, sumen*
- Stich.* 360: *pernam et glandium*
- Frg.* vs. 47 (Lindsay): *pernam, sumen, sueres, spetile, callum, glandia*
- Ibid.*, 98: *syncerasto . . . pernis, glandio*
2. 3. 82. 20; 7. 20. 4: *apri glandulas*
3. *HN* 8. 209: *Hinc censoriarum legum paginae interdictione penis abdomina, glandia, testiculi, vulvae, sincipita verrina . . .*
4. Such bits might come no doubt from beef, lamb,

chicken, etc.; Apicius (3. 1. 117) includes in one of his dishes *glandulas (h)aedinas*; but the above authors are obviously concentrating on pork.

5. *HN* 16. 185 (of texture of timbers): *Quibus (sc. arboribus) sunt tubera sicut in carne glandia . . .*

6. For this and the other pertinent physiological information I am indebted to a Scottish ham-curer in Vancouver, and to Drs. Persson, Skelton, Latimer, and Nichol of Burns' local packing plant.

7. *HN* 11. 175: *Tonsillae in homine, in sue glandulae.*

8. 7. 9. 1: *amplae et glandulosae cervicis* (of qualities to look for in a boar). (Celsus 2. 1. 4. 1, 8. 4 is of no help, as he is dealing only with the human body.)

9. These are elongated in the small pig, reaching from near the heart to the thoracic cavity; as the hog grows older, they contract to about 1½ to 2 inches.

#### ARISTOTLE *DE CAELO* A 9. 278 a 28ff.

In *De caelo* A 9 Aristotle seeks to prove that our Universe is the only one that exists. There is, in fact there can be, no other Cosmos.<sup>1</sup> It is true that the Cosmos is not a pure form (*εἶδος*) but "form in matter" and that as a rule a "form" finds its material realization in many different individuals.<sup>2</sup> Yet, in spite of this rule, our Cosmos is unique because it can be shown that all available cosmic matter, i. e., the entire substance of the elements, has been used up in its formation.<sup>3</sup> To illustrate this peculiar situation Aristotle imagines for a moment the possibility that all flesh and bone that exist were used up in the formation of one man; in that case no other man could come into being.<sup>4</sup> In point of fact, this is the second of the two illustrations which he uses; my reason for summarizing it first is that the point which Aristotle wishes to make is here brought out with all desirable clarity and that I could not say the same of the first illustration. The first illustration operates with a set of concepts that are familiar from other discussions of the relationship between pure form

and form in matter. The concepts are "flesh" (*σάρξ*), "nose" (*ῥίς*), "curved" (*τὸ καμπύλον*), and "aquiline" or "hooknosed" (*τὸ γρυπὸν*),<sup>5</sup> and the sentence in question reads in our MSS and editions as follows:

εἰ γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ γρυπότης καμπυλότης ἐν βινὶ ἢ σαρκί, καὶ ἔστιν ὅλη τῇ γρυπότητι ἡ σάρξ, εἰ ἔξ ἀπασῶν τῶν σαρκῶν μία γένοιτο σὰρξ καὶ ὑπάρξειεν ταύτῃ τὸ γρυπόν, οὐθὲν ἂν ἄλλ' οὐτ' εἴη γρυπὸν οὐτ' ἐνδέχοιτο γενέσθαι.<sup>6</sup>

The word *σάρξ* is in place where it is stated that flesh serves as matter for aquilinity (*καὶ ἔστιν ὅλη τῇ γρυπότητι ἡ σάρξ*); in the former part of the same conditional clause it is out of place because aquilinity (or the hooknosed) is simply a curvature in the nose.<sup>7</sup> Moreover in the second conditional clause the hypothetical possibility which Aristotle contemplates becomes not only more precise in its details but also more drastic and, *sit venia verbo*, more humorous if out of all available flesh one *nose* is formed which has the quality of aquilinity. We thus arrive at this text:

εἰ γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ γρυπότης καμπυλότης ἐν ῥινί [ἡ σαρκί], καὶ ἔστιν ὕλη τῇ γρυπότητι ἡ σὰρξ, εἰ ἐξ ἅπασιν τῶν σαρκῶν μία γένοιτο ῥίς (σὰρξ MSS) καὶ ὑπάρξειεν ταύτῃ τὸ γρυπὸν, οὐθὲν ἂν ἄλλ' οὐτ' εἴη γρυπὸν οὐτ' ἐνδέχοιτο γενέσθαι.

Critics who are, or consider themselves, *emunctae naris* may find the humor of the Gargantuan nose rather gross or grotesque. Yet this is a matter of taste rather than a basis for arguments. If arguments are still needed I should stress the point that in the parallel illustration flesh and bone, the

ὕλη, are formed into something new, namely one man, and that in the basic train of thought the elements are conceived as forming one Cosmos.<sup>8</sup> Moreover what Simplicius read in his copy of *De caelo* and paraphrased by the words εἰ ἡ τῆς ῥινὸς μορφή, κατὰ τὸ γρυπὸν αὐτῆς ἡ σιμὸν ἐν σαρκὶ πεφυκυῖα γενέσθαι, μία οὖσα τῷ ἀριθμῷ ἐν πάσῃ γίνοιτο τῇ σαρκί<sup>9</sup> appears to be the text as here emended.

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

#### NOTES

1. ἀδύναντον γενέσθαι πλείους (*scil.* οὐρανούς) 277 b 27.
2. 277 b 29-278 a 22.
3. 278 a 25-28; for the actual proof ὅτι ἐξ ἅπαντος τοῦ φυσικοῦ καὶ αἰσθητοῦ συνέστηκεν σώματος (*scil.* ὁ κόσμος) see 278 b 8 ff.
4. 278 a 32-35.
5. For other passages in which these concepts or their antonyms, σιμὸν and κοῖλον, are used for similar purposes see H. Bonitz, *Index Aristotelicus* (Berlin, 1870) s. v. γρυπὸν and σιμὸν.
6. 278 a 28-32.
7. Just as the antonym, τὸ σιμὸν (the "snubnosed")

is κοιλότης ἐν ῥινί, *Metaph.* Z5.1030b 31 f. Unlike κοῖλον and καμπύλον, σιμὸν and γρυπὸν are qualities of the nose and cannot be thought of apart from the nose.

8. In another respect the structure of the basic thought and of the second illustration is simpler than that of the first illustration. James Hutton has pointed out to me that they do not include anything corresponding to τὸ γρυπὸν of the first illustration. For the point which Aristotle wishes to make τὸ γρυπὸν is in fact less essential than ῥίς and her ὕλη.

9. Simplicius *In libros de caelo*, ed. J. L. Heiberg (*Comment. in Arist. Graeca*, VII), 278. 13 ff.

#### ATHENS AND AEGINA

Nearly ten years elapsed after the publication of the fourth volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* before anyone ventured to attack E. M. Walker's brilliant account<sup>1</sup> of what he termed the Unheralded War. At length L. E. Law<sup>2</sup> successfully undermined several of Walker's arguments; and finally, J. L. Myres<sup>3</sup> has shown that ἀκήρυκτος πόλεμος "cannot in any case mean . . . what E. M. Walker said it meant . . . : open official war by Athens on Aegina . . . for conduct so gross that no formal declaration of war was ever delivered to Aegina."

A few points may be added to the discussion of a subject which is so difficult and obscure that only the most thankful praise need be accorded Walker's attempt to solve the crucial difficulties.

1. "And when the Athenians were hastening to set forth against the Aeginetans, there came an oracle from Delphi bidding them refrain for thirty years from the time

of the Aeginetans' wrong-doing and in the thirty-first to mark out a precinct for Aeacus and begin their war against the Aeginetans and they should gain their wish" (Hdt. 5.89). This was not, Walker thought, a *vaticinium post eventum*, but a gloss on the text of the oracle, which cannot have used so precise a term as the thirty-first year, but must have spoken of one generation. "It was in the year 458 B.C. that the Athenians inflicted a decisive defeat at sea on the Aeginetans, and all but annihilated their navy. It was then that the success promised by the oracle was attained. If we reckon back 30 years from 458 B.C., we arrive at the year 488 B.C., the true date of the seizure of the sacred vessel. When in the year 458 B.C. the devout claimed the fulfilment of the oracle, they could point, in support of their contention, to the date of the dedication of the precinct of Aeacus, just 30 years before, the name of the archon in whose term of office the

dedication was made being either inscribed on the walls of the precinct itself, or else to be read in the decree ordering its erection." It must have been in the decree, if at all; for the shrine of Aeacus in the Agora, if built in 488, as Walker thought, was surely destroyed in the calamities of 480 and the original inscription of dedication lost. The shrine may, of course, have been rebuilt by Cimon, for it was standing in Herodotus' day. In any case the hypothetical inscription did not give the archon's name either for the year which Walker assumed or for the year of rededication: if it had done so, Herodotus could not have made such a mistake. If such a shrine existed at all before the Persian Wars<sup>4</sup> and bore an inscribed record of its foundation, this can only have suggested the dates assumed by Herodotus.

As for the oracle, the thirty years, if a gloss, are not derived from the text of the oracle, but represent the supposed interpretation of those who guessed that the oracle's original words were "one generation."<sup>5</sup> But one generation will suit the time between 506 and 482 almost as well. On the other hand, if Herodotus may be allowed to have attempted to state the truth, we must assume that the Athenians had disobeyed the advice of the oracle on any account both by not waiting for the prescribed term, and also by dedicating the shrine of Aeacus at once.<sup>6</sup> Either Herodotus knew what the oracle said, or he did not. If the latter, we cannot use him at all; if he did, what he says is evidence, and all the evidence we are likely to have.

Let us assume that he knew: "The oracles were carefully preserved in the archives of the states, and although it was easy enough to forge an oracle, it was not so easy to secure its general acceptance. At any rate the *onus probandi* rests with those who impugn the genuineness of any given oracle" (Walker, *loc. cit.*, p. 258, n.). The oracle, then, may be regarded as genuine.<sup>7</sup> If it were given *ca.* 506, as Herodotus thought, it could not justly be held responsible for any of the mishaps involved in Athens' troubles with Aegina during the

next fifty years, for *two* of the commandments of the oracle were violated at once.

No matter how one dates the outbreak of the Athens-Aegina troubles, during the quarter century preceding Delphi's resort to equivocal Medism there is discernible a strong pacifist tendency in this ghostly umpire of confusion. There was much trouble brewing, and Apollo knew it. (Had he not given advice to Lydia?) His problem, in addition to acquiring an influence which triumphantly outlived his treachery, was always how to dull, not to whet, the dagger points each rising state was sharpening for its neighbor. The oracle, then, is a neat bit of Delphian diplomacy.

2. A statement of Law's requires further examination: "It is not clear why Mr. Walker treats Herodotus' narrative of events as an Athenian charge."<sup>8</sup> But surely it is quite clear. The great historians of the nineteenth century devoted a considerable amount of their time and energy to prove that Herodotus' narrative of Athenian history rests on Athenian tradition. This is what Walker had in mind: the term πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος, if it could mean what Walker thought it did, was not the sort of label which the aggressor proudly attaches to his action; it would be, in fact, an accusation against Aegina.<sup>9</sup> Yet the strong presumption that Herodotus' account is drawn from Athenian sources, whether verbal or written, tells heavily against Walker's theory. If we compare the statements in Herodotus 5.81, 89, 90 with those in 6.87-90, we see that the historian assigns an important place both in his narrative and in his chronology to the successive feuds of Athens and her chief neighbor-by-sea. His account, further, is self-consistent. "The Thebans were trying to draw Aegina into their war with Athens. . . . Aegina did not wish to be openly involved, but 'sent the Aeacidae'. . . . The Thebans returned these fetishes (or relics) and asked for live troops. Aegina still refrained from open rupture with Athens; but there was ἀκήρυκτος πόλεμος. This can only mean that 'without formal declaration' there was

raiding and reprisal, which is exactly what Herodotus goes on to describe."<sup>10</sup>

3. What could be more unlikely (to paraphrase Walker's position) than two "unheralded wars"? It would indeed be most unlikely if the words meant what Walker thought they did; and also if it were not for the Athenian charge of a "double crime" (τὼν πρότερον ἀδικημάτων, Hdt. 6.87, where πρότερον surely proves that Hdt. had the passage 5.88,89 in mind; it would be unreasonable to expect cross references). Passing over treacherous *argumenta ex silentio*<sup>11</sup> we may confidently assert that Athens and Aegina entertained

the most unfriendly relations with each other during the half century between 506 and 458, whether or not the "ancient feud" (5.81) carries us back further; and that there was a succession of "incidents," beginning with the one described (and correctly dated) by Herodotus 5.89-90. We must therefore regretfully add another border feud, if no full-scale war, to Athens' rise to power. We are confronted again with an earlier example of what Toynbee likes to call "the stimulus of pressure."

W. C. HELMBOLD

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

#### NOTES

1. *CAH*, IV, 254-59; cf. H. W. Parke, *History of the Delphic Oracle*, p. 177; A. Andrewes, *Ann. Brit. School Athens*, XXXVII (1936-37), 1-7, which contains important suggestions. Archeological evidence is examined by Dunbabin, *ibid.*, pp. 83-91.

2. *CP*, XXX (1935), 164-67.

3. *CR*, LVII (1943), 66-67.

4. W. W. How, for example, in his note on Hdt. 5.89, 3, doubts the existence of the shrine before 480.

5. The notion that 30 years are equivalent to one generation seems first to be found in Heraclitus (A 19, Diels; cf. H. Fränkel, *AJP*, LIX (1938), 89-91; D. W. Prakken, *Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology* (Lancaster, 1943), pp. 2, 19ff.). Law regards Walker's contention (that the expression, "the thirty-first year," can be nothing but the phraseology of those who claimed that the oracle had been fulfilled) as incapable of proof. At first sight this seems to be reasonable scepticism: it might even be argued that, though the precise date appears reckless, it really absolved the oracle. The Athenians were eager to fight and did in fact fight long before the prescribed term expired, as Apollo knew they would. (The tradition in Plutarch [*Them.* 4] well represents the Attic emotion of the time.) Yet, even so, Walker is quite right: there seems to be no oracle extant which gives anything like so precise a prescription in terms of years.

My colleague, Mr. Joseph Fontenrose, has kindly contributed his opinion: "The oracle can only be genuine if we suppose that all it enjoined was 'one generation.' It would then be prescribing a cult as well as recommending postponement for the war, perhaps in the hope that the next generation would be willing to keep the peace. Herodotus 'then begin the war' may represent 'don't think of going to war until then.' One must always be suspicious of oracles unless they are contemporaneous with the reporter; but this one will do, if we may suppose that Herodotus gives us merely an indirect form colored by interpretation. The shrine to Aeacus, of course, represents Delphi's pious desire to reconcile Athens and Aegina by means of a common cult."

7. The only alternative is to emend the text, and it is, in fact, an easy change: transpose Αἰακῷ τέμενος ἀποδέξαντας to follow Δελφῶν and insert καὶ to read: ἤλθε μαντήιον ἐκ Δελφῶν Αἰακῷ τέμενος ἀποδέξαντας <καὶ> ἐπαχόντας κτλ. This, indeed, suits the next statement (5.89, 3) better, since it implies that the immediate building of the shrine was not contrary to the oracle, but that the reprisals on Aegina were.

6. See J. Fontenrose (quoted in note 5 above).

8. *Op. cit.*, p. 166.

9. For this, and for several other suggestions, I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. J. A. O. Larsen.

10. J. L. Myres, *loc. cit.* 11. Cf. Macan, Appendix viii.

#### CALLIMACHUS AND CATULLUS

Pfeiffer's magnificent new edition of Callimachus<sup>1</sup> should arouse new interest in the great scholar's poet of Alexandria. A scholar's poet Callimachus was by choice, and only a sympathetic interpretation, such as that which Howald has given German readers,<sup>2</sup> can make the elegant whimsy of his poetry live for a wider public. The fragmentary tatters in which his major works survive make it a ponderous task for even the expert to win any familiarity

with a work like the *Aetia* which exerted so powerful an influence on the Roman poets of the age of Caesar and Augustus.<sup>3</sup> It is only through the gradual recovery of Callimachus that it becomes possible to assess the debt of these poets to him.

Catullus can, I believe, be made to contribute something further toward the reconstruction of what is already one of the best-known parts of the *Aetia*. In the third book of the *Aetia* Callimachus told

the story of the love of Acontius for Cydippe. Inspired by this narrative, Ovid related the story in his own way in the *Heroides* (20 and 21), and Aristaenetus later gave a prosaic but apparently faithful summary of it based on Callimachus. Now Catullus makes no reference to Acontius or Cydippe, but he does mention an apple, which has recalled that of Acontius to the minds of editors and commentators.

The passage in question is in the elegy addressed to Ortalus (65), where Catullus apologizes for not being able at the moment to offer the sort of poem Ortalus had requested, and presents as a substitute a translation from Callimachus, presumably his translation of the *Lock of Berenice* (66), the original of which now appears to have stood at the end of the *Aetia*, at least in a second edition.<sup>4</sup> He offers this substitute, as he says, in order that Ortalus may not think that his request has escaped Catullus' mind,

"ut missum sponsi furtivo munere malum  
procurrit casto virginis e gremio,  
quod miserae oblatae molli sub veste locatum,  
dum adventu matris prosilit, excutitur;  
atque illud prono praeceps agitur decursu,  
huic manat tristi conscius ore rubor"

[65. 19-24].

Rosbach separated these lines from the preceding with the remark that they contained a fragment of a Callimachean poem, because he felt that poem 66 alone did not satisfactorily fulfill the promise of *carmina* in line 16, and that lines 19-24 were part of another *carmen*.<sup>5</sup> The unity of the poem is too obvious and the effect of the simile too striking to allow us to suppose that it is the achievement of pure chance that these lines should have been brought together with those which precede. The apple of the passage has suggested to others that the lines were inspired by Callimachus. So Baehrens thought that the whole simile was derived from some Greek poet, and perhaps from Callimachus' *Cydippe*.<sup>6</sup> More recently Kroll has commented that there is a fine nuance in the fact that the motif of the comparison was inspired by Callimachus, in whose *Cydippe* an apple thrown

by Acontius brings about the union of the pair. But, says he, the actual point of the comparison, the rolling away of the apple, comes from somewhere else.<sup>7</sup>

I suspect that these verses are, indeed, inspired by Callimachus' *Cydippe*, that they are, in fact, a close imitation if not an actual translation of lines from that portion of the *Aetia*. Aristaenetus' version seems to me to make this reasonably clear. He says that, when Acontius rolled the apple before the feet of Cydippe, the nurse, marvelling at its size and color, snatched it up: ἄμα διαποροῦσα τίς ἄρα τοῦτο τῶν παρθένων μετέωρος ἀπέβαλε τοῦ προκολπίου. The situation which the nurse imagines is certainly the same as that described by Catullus; a maiden in her confusion drops an apple from her bosom.<sup>8</sup> Aristaenetus does not necessarily give all the details of the nurse's speculation as they may have been described in his source, but that is not surprising since it is incidental to the main thread of his narrative. If Kroll had had Aristaenetus' version in mind, he would certainly have seen that the whole point of Catullus' comparison is implicit in Callimachus.

In reconstructing the *Diegesis* for this part of the *Aetia*, E. A. Barber found no space for any mention of the nurse or her speculations and concluded that "this θεραπαινίς (the *nutrix* of Ovid *Her.* 21) apparently plays no part in the account of Callimachus as summarized by the *Diegetes*."<sup>9</sup> This does not mean that the nurse was not used by Callimachus, as she certainly was, to judge by her appearance in both Ovid and Aristaenetus.

The simile of the escaping apple could, of course, be original with Catullus or it could be imitated from some other source, but that seems unlikely under the circumstances. Catullus evidently had Callimachus in mind as he was writing the poem, and Callimachus is known to have provided the material out of which the simile is made, and that in a poem which was all but sure to have been familiar to Catullus.<sup>10</sup>

The little sidelight of the nurse's speculation would be most appropriate to the



narrative manner of Callimachus as we know it from his own poems and from those of his imitators. The shrewd old nurse, seeing the handsome apple roll at her feet, assumed at once that one of the other maidens present had sprung to her feet at the arrival of her mother, thus

letting fall the lover's gift which she had tucked in her bosom and which she forgot in her self-conscious confusion.

LLOYD W. DALY

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### NOTES

1. *Fragmenta*, Vol. I (Oxford, 1949).  
2. A recent note on Arsinöe disregards the very existence of the extensive papyrus fragments of the *Coma Berenices* which now give us the original of Catullus' 66th poem.

3. *Der Dichter Kallimachos von Kyrene* (Zurich, 1943). For the *Iambica* we now have the spirited translation of C. M. Dawson in his "Iambi of Callimachus," *YCS*, XI (1950), 1-168.

4. Cf. Pfeiffer *ad loc.* and Rostagni in his review, *RFIC*, XXVIII (1950), 70f.

5. In his second Teubner ed. (Leipzig, 1860), 18f.

6. *Catulli Veronensis liber*, new ed. by Schulze (Leipzig, 1893).

7. *Catull* (Leipzig, 1929).

8. Catullus' *gremio* must surely be understood to mean *bosom* and not *lap*. Ernout-Meillet (*Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, 2d ed. [Paris, 1939], p. 434) give the primary meaning of *gremium* as "proprement 'ce que contient une brassée', c. à d. l'espace délimité par les bras et la poitrine." By a transfer *gremium* then comes to refer to the fold of a garment over the breast, as it does in accounts of the famous performance of Fabius before the Carthaginian senate (Florus 2. 6. 7 and

Silius 2. 387). The grammarian Agroecius is even more specific in stating (7. 123, 24 K) "sinum dicimus exterius sinuatae vestis receptaculum, gremium interius acinetiae vestis secretum." Aristaeus here uses the word ἀγκύλιον which is unambiguous and guarantees the meaning *bosom* for Catullus.

9. "Notes on the Diegesis of Callimachus (*P. M.*, 18)" *CQ*, XXXIII (1939), 65.

10. A passage from Festus is often quoted in this connection. On the statement *nec mulieri nec gremio credi oportere* he remarks: "Proverbium est, quod et illa incerti et levis animi est, et plerumque in gremio posita, cum in oblivionem venerunt propterea exsurgunt, prociidunt" (165 M). This might sound as though it were written with Catullus 65 in mind but the similarity of thought is misleading, for there is no mention of an apple in the proverb or in Festus' explanation of it; the identity of situation in Callimachus and Catullus does not carry over; and the rest of what Festus says might easily come from general experience. The ancients must have been generally well aware of the insecurity of anything deposited in the bosom of their women's flowing garb. For "The Symbolism of the Apple in Classical Antiquity," see B. O. Foster, *HSCP*, X (1899), 39-55.

### PLUTARCH'S ANCESTRY

In the *De sera numinis vindicta*, chapter 13 (558 A) Plutarch, the principal speaker, remarks to his brother<sup>1</sup> Timon: ἀλλ' ὅμοις γε δέηπον πλέον ἔχειν ἑτέρων ἐν τε Βοιωτοῖς Ὀφελτιάδαι [so Xylander; ὁ φιλιτιάδαι MSS] γένος ὄντες ἀξιούτε καὶ παρὰ Φωκεῦσι διὰ Δαίφρατον....

It has not, I believe, been noticed that as Timon is Plutarch's brother, this passage indicates Plutarch's descent from Opheltas and Daiphantus. Of course Timon may have been only his half-brother, and thus either Opheltas or Daiphantus or both no ancestors of Plutarch; but for this there is no evidence. It might also be questioned whether the Timon of the dialogue is Plutarch's brother. But everything points to his being so;<sup>2</sup> and the touch of friendly banter in chapter 13 would very well suit

the language of one brother to another. We may also note that one of the two remaining interlocutors, Patrocleas, is mentioned elsewhere as Plutarch's γαμβρός.<sup>3</sup>

But why should Plutarch speak in the second person, and not the first? The second person doubtless helps the bantering tone; but the main reason for its use, as Professor De Lacy points out to me, is that Plutarch is making an *argumentum ad hominem*.

Plutarch's interest in Daiphantus, whose life he composed,<sup>4</sup> is thus very natural. Opheltas is mentioned but once<sup>5</sup> in the surviving works; doubtless very little was known of him.

BENEDICT EINARSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

#### NOTES

1. K. Ziegler in *RE*, XXI<sup>2</sup> (1951), 646. 11-14.

2. *Ibid.*, 646. 37-40

3. *Ibid.*, 651. 27f.

5. *Life of Cimon* 1. 1 (478 E).

4. *Mor.* 244 B.

NOTE ON TERENCE *EUNUCHUS* 19-24

Quam nunc acturi sumus,  
Menandri Eunuchum, postquam aediles  
emerunt  
perfecti sibi ut inspiciundi esset copia.  
magistratus quom ibi adesset, ocepta est agi.  
exclamat furem, non poetam fabulam  
dedisse ....

Everyone familiar with Terentian usage will perceive that line 22 contains a difficult problem, since nowhere else does Terence employ the imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive with *cum* temporal. In view of this, Walter Petersen, who set forth with great clarity the usage of the older Latin writers in cases of this sort in this journal some years ago (*CP*, XXVI [1931], 399), suspected, albeit with some hesitation, that the force of *cum* was here causal rather than temporal: "because they arrived (after waiting for them) the acting began." But a Roman of Terence's day could not have imagined Ambivius Turpio or Minucius Prothymus daring to start reciting in the absence of the aediles, nor can we believe that anything of the sort occurred to Terence. Upon careful consideration, it becomes certain that the words "magistratus quom ibi adesset" are quite inappropriate and unworthy of the poet, regardless of whether they are taken in a temporal or causal sense. This is plain from the word-order, where "magistratus" is placed first in the sentence and verse for emphasis, and from the circumstance that "ibi" is superfluous in this passage as it is customarily read. Neither the position of *magistratus* nor the presence of *ibi* would be justified if Terence had merely meant to say "ubi (quoniam) aedilis signum dedit, initium recitandi factum est."

A slight change in punctuation will remove the difficulty here, leaving the poet's words intact:

quam nunc acturi sumus,  
Menandri Eunuchum, postquam aediles  
emerunt,

perfecti sibi ut inspiciundi esset copia,  
magistratus quom ibi adesset. — ocepta est  
agi:  
exclamat furem, non poetam fabulam  
dedisse ....

It will be observed that the passage now calls for a radically different interpretation: after the aediles had bought the *Eunuchus* for the highest price paid up to that time (and, human nature being what it is, we may be sure that even that price was exaggerated by popular gossip), Luscius Lanuvinus, full of envy, sought out the aediles and requested that he be allowed to examine Terence's play, declaring that he would be satisfied to read the play under guard in the temple itself; his request was granted, and he departed. Luscius at first kept quiet, but at the next *Megalesia* he publicly attacked the rival poet in the theater with insults as unjust, if we are to believe Terence, as they were unexpected. The word-order is now justified, and *ibi* no longer superfluous, but rather most essential: Aedile: "What do you want? To take the play and read it at home? Luscius: "By no means; I'll read it through *here*; set a guard to watch me if you like."

Thus the troublesome problem mentioned at the beginning of this note is solved, the subjunctive for *adesset* in an indirect quotation of Luscius' words is unexceptionable; the substitution of *ibi* for the direct *hic* (i.e., in the temple, not the theater) follows automatically; no less justifiable is the emphatic position of *magistratus* (an undetermined official rather than the aedile himself); furthermore this emphatic position skillfully suggests that it was strange that Luscius did not voice his charges on the spot, directly after having read the play through.

EMIL VETTER

VIENNA

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars.*

By PAUL FRIEDLÄNDER. With the collaboration of HERBERT B. HOFFLEIT. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1948. Pp. viii + 198. \$ 5.00.

In 1878 Georg Kaibel published his *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, a collection, complete to date of publication, of Greek metrical inscriptions actually to be found on the stones. It is significant that, to the more than eleven hundred titles in the regular text, Kaibel had to add a considerable number while his work was in press, and still more after the rest had been printed. A good-sized supplement published by the same author only one year later<sup>1</sup> showed that, even then, a new edition would soon be necessary.

The new edition has had to wait seventy years, and even this volume is a "first installment" (p. 2). The editors have made chronology rather than, as Kaibel did, geography, their first principle of classification. On this basis, they distinguish four major periods: (1) from the beginnings down to the Persian Wars, (2) from the Persian Wars to Alexander, (3) from Alexander to Augustus, (4) from Augustus on. In the present volume the editors deal with the first period, "leaving for future consideration" the other periods. We are to hope that this phrase means nothing more remote than that the other volumes are in preparation and will appear before too long.

Within the period, texts are arranged first by form, second by length, third by occasion or content. Thus, according to form, there are four groups in four chapters: hexameter, elegiac, incomplete or

irregular dactylic schemes, and iambic with trochaic. Within the hexametric group, we then find: sepulchral inscriptions in single hexameters; dedicatory inscriptions in single hexameters; sepulchral inscriptions in more than one hexameter; dedicatory inscriptions in more than one hexameter; and miscellaneous inscriptions in hexameter. Members of the elegiac group are subdivided in an analogous way, by distich instead of line. The other groups, far smaller, need no such subdivision. The method serves for this period; whether it is appropriate, and will be adopted, for the later volumes, is to be doubted.

There are in all 179 numbered items, but actually more, since several inscriptions of similar type may be grouped under a single number, e.g., 123 a, b, c, and d. Each item is printed in standardized form, with a literal English translation, brief critical commentary, and more extended general commentary. Place, description of monument, date or chronological considerations, and the last main epigraphical publication, are set at the head of each item. Description and general commentary sometimes seem too brief; but on the whole, the editors have ably steered their middle course between the voluminous and the meager.

There is an index of opening phrases; a table of parallel references, but no reverse table from *IG*, Kaibel, etc. to this publication; a Greek index of proper names; and a general index of subjects.

One important principle of inclusion should be noted. The editors have incorporated epigrams well attested as inscriptions on ancient authority, but which have not in modern times been read on monuments. Examples include the "Chest of Cypselus" from Pausanias 5. 17-19 (No. 54, pp. 56-58); the epitaph of Archedice, from Thucydides 6. 59 (No. 138, p. 127);

1. *Rhein. Mus.*, XXXIV (1879), 181-213.

the inscribed and old, though bogus, "dedication of Amphitryon" from Herodotus 5. 59 (No. 17, pp. 23-24), etc. The principle is sound, but its application calls for caution and skill. The editors introduce their principle with the blood-curdling statement that "it is essentially unimportant whether an inscription was copied from a monument by Günther Klaffenbach, Benjamin D. Meritt, or Louis Robert, or on the other hand by Thucydides, Polemon, or an unknown authority in Pausanias" (p. 4). What of Simonides [?] 90 Diehl, where literary authorities give two versions of a couplet which was never there on the stone? Or the three versions of Simonides [?] 92 Diehl? Despite these alarms, it becomes obvious in the sequel that the editors know what they are about; with the possible reservation, in cases of epigrams attributed in the *Palatine Anthology* to major poets, that their standards are too rigid rather than too lax, of which somewhat more below.

In the general commentaries attached to individual items, and in the general introductions on hexametric and elegiac traditions, there is much that is of interest and much that is controversial. It is here that the epigrammata are dealt with not merely as specimens of orthography and alphabet, which they are, but also as a part of Greek literature, which they are too. Commentaries on the archaic inscribed hexameters and their relationships to Homeric and western epic are particularly sound and illuminating. The general discussion of elegiac epigrams, their origin and their connection with literary forms, is far less satisfactory because it rests, I believe, on a basic confusion. Briefly, the account given by the editors (pp. 65-70) is this: Elegy, while primarily and rightly associated with a song of sorrow, "may, from the very beginning, have included almost any sort of pathetic or ecstatic [reviewer's query: what *ecstatic* elegies are known?] or emphatic song accompanied by the flute"; "The field was, or became, so wide as to include festal joy, martial appeal, prayer, and reflection." While it is not certain

what the early connections were, the metrical epitaph might have grown out of elegies of mourning sung to the flute at burials; metrical dedications from elegiac hymns. Of the two epigrammata attributed in the *Palatine Anthology* to Archilochus (16 and 17 Diehl) the former

Ἵψηλοὺς Μεγάτιμον Ἀριστοφώντα τε Νέξου  
κίονας, ὃ μεγάλη Γὰρ, ὑπένερθεν ἔχεις

is, if by Archilochus, "not an epitaph, but the beginning of a threnodic elegy"; the second is a true dedication, copied from the stone, but there is no reason to think it is the work of Archilochus. For inscribed poems were unsigned, and so in the case of epigrammata ascribed in the *Anthology* to Anacreon and Simonides, either they are inscriptions and therefore to be taken away from the major authors (except in such cases as the epitaph of Simonides for Megistias, Herodotus 7. 228, which Herodotus seems to have known was by Simonides); or else they may be rightly attributed, but were never inscribed, rather are distichs from elegies. We are left, therefore, with the impression that epigrammata remained a secondary form, rarely favored by big poets, and drawing constantly on "elegiac tradition" or "threnodic elegy" (see commentaries on Nos. 70, 104, 112, 136, 139).

To regard inscribed epigram as essentially a subderivative of sung elegy betrays confusion. The confusion lies here, that if we make *elegy* stand for a poem to be recited or sung (to the flute, scholars insist) and epigram for an inscribed poem, usually in elegiac meter, we have no term left for the short poem, in elegiac meter, which makes a single point and can stand alone, often in a single distich. Consider Archilochus 16, quoted above (or Archilochus 1 or 2), and contrast it with Archilochus 10, the poem addressed to Pericles, on the drowned men. The latter *is* an elegy, and it has little to do with our inscribed epitaphs; it addresses the survivor and the poet himself, and *dismisses* the dead. That is, if you like, a threnodic elegy, but then 16 is not a threnodic elegy, nor the be-

gunning of one, but a complete poem, as Bowra saw. Let us call it an epigram, so distinguishing it from the elegy of Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus, Solon, and Archilochus himself (the distinction is pretty clear for Latin poetry) and reserve epigramma for the *inscribed* epigram, whatever its meter. Among the "fragments" of Archilochus in elegiac meter, 1, 2, 6, 15, 16, and 17 are not, or need not be, fragments at all, but complete poems in one or two distichs. They have little in common with elegy except the meter, just as the gnome of Charon the smith has little in common with Semonides' *Essay on Women*, or Attic tragedy for that matter, except the meter. They need have nothing to do with the flute;<sup>2</sup> they may, like the epigrammata, have been written to be read. Surely, an appropriately short gnome, or biographical notice, scratched on wood or wax, is closer to the short gnome, prayer, or biographical notice scratched on stone, than to the repetitive chant sung in company. And this the editors have implied. "Elegy . . . had . . . the artistic advantage of a closed form, while the hexameter, essentially, admitted of infinite repetition" (p. 66). Epigram, not elegy; for the *elegy* of Tyrtaeus repeats itself forever, only by distichs, not by single lines.

In such terms, Simonides, who practiced almost every form of poetry known in his time, composed both epigrams and epigrammata. So, probably, did Anacreon. The editors reject Bowra's view, that Anacreon included his epigraphic verses in his collected works, on the grounds that collected works are too modern a concept and there is no evidence for such a thing before the Alexandrine period (p. 67). No evidence except necessity. Were no "works"

set down and preserved? And where, for a writer of short poems, do we draw the line between "works" and "collected works"? The denial merely creates a vacuum. Clearly, such a poem as No. 152, *Anth. Pal.* 6. 136 may have been written, and kept, by Anacreon, because the *Anthology* says it is his, and because period and quality suit; and, clearly, it may not be by him, because the *Anthology* is full of mistaken attributions. In all such cases, scepticism is wise, but sometimes what looks like scepticism is really dogmatism with a negative cast.

So much attention to literary origins may be out of place in a review of an epigraphic collection, yet the issues were indicated, and conclusions must be drawn if they can be. It is in such matters that disagreements are inevitable, but in the fascinating detail of the particular titles various points arise. I give them as they come:

*P. 8 and No. 7, p. 16.* — "It is no accident that there are few archaic inscriptions in verse from Sparta." Yes, but why?

*No. 6, p. 15 (see also Nos. 31, 71, 85).* — "Brave" seems too particular a translation for ἀγαθός except in a military context. In Simonides 4 Diehl the adjective, applied to a man's character, does not mean "brave."

*No. 26, p. 31.* — It might be noted that the office of *proxenos*, here and in Kaibel 36 and 37, is not the same as what is described elsewhere.

*No. 48, p. 51.* — To the note on ἐσθλοῦ πατρὸς, might one adduce Alcaeus 119. 14 and *Scolia Attica* 24 Diehl?

*No. 69a, p. 78.* — Anacreon did not live with the Pisistratidae in the "middle" of the 6th century, which is where the editors have dated the inscription.

*No. 78, p. 83.* — ἀμώμητος, the editors' second choice, seems far preferable to ἀμώμητο[ν], their first. The parallels indicate τέρμα λαχὼν θανάτου as a likely half-pentameter, and ἀμώμητος attaches better to a man than to an abstraction. When the word is cited from Archilochus, it might be mentioned that he uses it in irony. For δόκιμος and its civic character, see the usage of Herodotus (37 times in Powell's *Lexicon*), also Alcaeus 119. 12 Diehl.

*No. 79, p. 84.* — For δ ψυχῇ παῦρα δέδωκε ἀγαθόν, translated "a calling which gives life

2. Bowra obviously understands the self-sufficiency of such poems. Yet when he says (*EGE*, pp. 8-9): "Such simple couplets were probably improvised and sung in the intervals of fighting, when someone had a flute and the poet was called on for a song," while he may be right, he is really implying that the wayfarer could not read the epitaph of Tettichus properly unless he had a flute about him. All that our ancient evidence proves is that elegy, if sung, was often sung to the flute; it does not prove that anything in elegiac meter could be communicated only with the help of a flute; and epigrammata prove the contrary.



few joys," the editors seem to have chosen far the best interpretation, except that "life" in English is very general for ψυχή. "The soul" is objectionable, though almost unavoidable; "a man's life" might serve.

No. 83, p. 87. — To the profound note on ἀνθρώπου, add Simonides 6 Diehl.

No. 114, p. 110. — To make Γρόρων a person adds one person too many and contradicts the first line. And why γάρ (not translated)?

No. 127, p. 120. — The editors' suggestion that βίον be supplied as a personal name seems worth insisting on, for otherwise the child who vowed the dedication must go unnamed.

No. 135, p. 124. — νεῖσθε ἐπὶ πράγμα ἀγαθόν is translated "proceed to worthy tasks." "Worthy tasks" is at best stilted ("good work" in the commentary below is much better), but one may wonder whether the phrase really means more than the εὖ πράσσει of No. 5, p. 14.

No. 138, p. 128. — The suggestion that ἦδε κέκευθε κόνης originates in "threnodic elegy" is almost certainly wrong, for the reasons considered above. If the phrase occurs in elegy, it is elegy imitating epigramma, to whose context the phrase is appropriate; not vice versa.

No. 142, p. 132. — The name of Mantinea, in the text, should appear in the translation.

No. 164, p. 151. — To call Athens, in "c. 510 B.C.," the "young democracy," is cutting an approximate date very fine.

No. 167, p. 155. — "Alcmeonides' Panathenaic victory must have been won at some time within Pisistratus' years of exile, 554–538 (Bizard in *BCH*). This statement, partially corrected below on the same page, is too absolute. The chronology of Pisistratus' exiles is too disturbed to admit so positive a date; and we can not say that, at all times when Pisistratus was in power, the Alcmeonids were in exile.

No. 170, p. 158. — Concerning Myrrhine, who died of the plague, it is stated that the cause of her death could not have been given in prose. One fails to understand why it *could* not have been given, in view of Laconian prose inscriptions giving cause of death.

Many other particular points occur, and will occur to the reader, but this review is already too long and too censorious. It is better to end by recording a summary

opinion, namely, that the difficult task has been carried through with conspicuous skill, erudition, and good sense.

ὅτι δὴ θαρσαλέον ἔπος

εὐχομαι καὶ νόστῳ δίκας, σύγγνωθί μοι.

RICHMOND LATTIMORE

*Bryn Mawr College*

*Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire.* By J. MAROUZEAU. ("Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris," Vol. LIII.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1949. Pp. 232. Fr. 600; \$2.50.

Since 1910, when M. Jules Marouzeau published his doctoral thesis on the present participle in the Republican period, he has never ceased in various periodicals and memorial volumes to illuminate the evolution of literary Latin; and his decision to republish these articles with the occasional addition of new material in order to give them unity of purpose will be warmly welcomed. The book appropriately appears in the series of the Société de Linguistique, in whose *Bulletin* and *Mémoires* much of his earlier work on this subject is to be found.

The eight chapters, most of which incorporate several essays, develop the theme as follows. I ("Aspects du latin ancien") deals with the contribution of agriculture and of peasant life to the primitive language. It then proceeds to consider Plautus as a purist, who, like Naevius, championed *urbanitas* or the pure speech of the city against *rusticitas* or the influence of rural dialects, and thereby won a reputation for *Latinitas* and *elegantia*. II ("La dérivation") is primarily concerned with the part played by suffixes, and mentions some historical reasons (including meter) for later divergences from the original regularity of such word-formations. III ("Le vocabulaire") discusses the natural resources of Latin in synonyms and its tendency towards amplification and reinforcement of vocabulary. Since Marouzeau confessedly adopts the linguistic approach,

he asks that the study of words should be animated by the use of more scientific criteria than meaning alone. He makes some interesting remarks on the verbal idiosyncracies of certain authors, and discusses in some detail Vergil's fondness for etymologies. Various lexical peculiarities are then mentioned, e.g., the comparative frequency of words with initial C, P, and S, as well as the infrequency of initial G and B where words of foreign origin are in the majority. The chapter ends with a note on the Latin accent from *REL*, IX (1931), 41-44, and Petron. 68 is adhered to as evidence not for but against stress, despite J. Cousin's qualifying remarks (*ibid.*, pp. 226-28) and Kenneth M. Abbott's dismissal of its relevance ("The Grammarians and the Latin Accent," *Classical Studies in Honor of W. A. Oldfather* [Urbana, 1943], pp. 1-19, n. 62).

IV ("La 'copia dicendi'") illustrates from the annalists and earlier orators the brevity which was enforced by the *patrii sermonis egestas*, and shows how Roman religious and juridical phraseology helped to enrich the language. V ("La conquête de l'abstrait") tells how poor in abstracts Latin of the early period was, and how this poverty was gradually overcome. VI ("L'apport du grec") deals with the influence of Greek, which manifested itself so conspicuously in poetry, but was resisted in oratory. VII ("La syntaxe") again advocates the historical approach of linguistics and criticizes subjectivity, whether logical or psychological. As an example of syntactical method, Marouzeau adds a résumé of his earlier work on the present participle, which, it may be mentioned, was highly commended by Wackernagel. VIII ("La stylistique") discusses the principles and methods of the science of style, and mentions, as an instance of stylistic change, how Cicero and his contemporaries abandoned the secondary position of *cum*, *si*, and other connectives in subordinate clauses. (This subject has been developed by Marouzeau in "La construction des subordonnants," *REL*, XXIV [1946], 247-60.) The chapter also takes account of the

language of poetry, including indirect and negative means of expression, and ends with a description of the artistry of Horace in sound effects, use of proper names, and accommodation of syntax to meter.

This collection of essays, though regarded modestly by Marouzeau as only a substructure for the more systematic investigations of younger scholars, is rich in suggestions which others may develop. For example, one task is to assess etymologizing tendencies in the poets on the lines begun by the author himself for Vergil, by Meillet for Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius, and by N. I. (not I. N., as on p. 79) Herescu for Ovid. Another lies in describing their efforts to overcome the restrictions of their meters, and a third in further study of their apparent colloquialisms. In fact, a scientific study of Latin poetic style is badly needed, as Marouzeau suggested when he reviewed Bertil Axelsson's *Unpoetische Wörter* (Lund, 1945) in *REL*, XXIV (1946), 320-21. Marouzeau follows Löfstedt (*Syntactica*, II [Lund, 1933], 365) in explaining why the ties between poetry and colloquial language are essentially closer than between poetry and prose; and, when he turns (pp. 182-85) to "l'expression indirecte," i.e., periphrasis, compression, metaphor, synonym, etc., which are described as "le secret du style" of many a Latin poet, his remark "il est instructif d'en démonter le mécanisme" is to be applauded. There lies the way to a *Poétique latine*.

The misprints, which occur mainly in titles, references, and quotations are not serious, though it may be mentioned that the page number of Hofmann's *Latein. Umgangsspr.* (2d ed.) should be 80 and not 30 (p. 65). Two footnotes (pp. 29, 61) cite the articles published in *Mém. Soc. Ling.*, XVII (1911-12), 266-80 and XX (1918), 77-88 as "Notes sur la formation du latin classique," but Marouzeau was then using "fixation" and not "formation" in the main title of this series. In the second citation "classique" should be "littéraire" and the year of publication 1918 instead of 1916, though it should be remembered,

out of respect for Marouzeau's achievement, that this paper was written from a camp for prisoners of war at Crefeld in the earlier year.

The two statements, "*senex* est peut-être la forme rurale du mot qui se présente au génitif sous la forme *senis*" (p. 20) and "un mot important, *senex*, semble étranger à la série des mots ruraux" (p. 22, n.1), seem slightly inconsistent. The remark, "*lumen*, par rapport à *lux*, (signifie) 'la bienfaisante lumière'" (repeated from *Traité de stylistique latine*, 2d ed. [1946], p. 166) is more questionable than the definition on the same page, "*lux* (est) la lumière qui éclaire, *lumen* la source lumineuse" (p. 68); but, while it is true that "la différence entre deux synonymes n'est pas une chose simple, réductible à une formule" (p. 71), neither is an improvement on J. S. Reid's *obiter dictum*, "*lux* is daylight or sunlight, *lumen* light generally" (on Cic. *Acad.* 2. 8. 26). Prop. 4. 6. 27: "(Phoebus) linquens *stantem* se vindice Delon" is quoted among the passages "où le verbe 'être' nous suffit pour exprimer une disposition, une localisation" (p. 114), but *stantem* is not merely "un verbe figuratif" in a poet who wished to describe the  $\chi\theta\omicron\nu\delta\varsigma$   $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\epsilon\lambda\alpha\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu\eta\gamma\tau\omicron\nu$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$  (Pind. Frag. 78) and recollected Call. *Hymn.* 4. 51-54 (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3. 75-77).

The "fuscus Hydaspes" of Hor. *Serm.* 2. 8. 14 is surely not the obscure "compagnon d'Énée" (p. 203) who is mentioned in *Aen.* 10. 747, but a slave named after the "fabulosus Hydaspes" of *Carm.* 1. 22. 7-8. Incidentally, did Horace introduce the Hydaspes playfully in this "integer vitae" ode in order to tease Aristius Fuscus? The vocative "Fusce" as the first word in the first adonic balances "Hydaspes" which is the second word in the second adonic (similarly Marouzeau notes on p. 214 the emphatic repetition of verbs at the beginning of the last lines of three consecutive Alcaic stanzas in *Carm.* 1. 34). We may compare Tibull. 2. 3. 55: "comites fusi, quos India torret," and this may also be the point of Horace's anguished "huncine solem / tam nigrum surrexe

mihi!" (*Serm.* 1. 9. 72-73) when Aristius Fuscus leaves him to the mercy of the bore.

Marouzeau of course is justified in regarding the sequence of internal or "leonine" rhymes in Hor. *Carm.* 1. 1. 3-10 as intentional and not due to the fortunes of inflection (pp. 198-99); and he might have printed verse 2, "o et praesidium et dulce decus meum," as he did in the two editions of his *Traité de stylistique* (1935 and 1946), for the rhyme is not slurred by the elision of -um but more probably maintained by the reduction of *et*. Again, since one reviewer of the first edition of the *Traité* has asked whether *rotis* would really rhyme with *nobilis* in verses 5-6, "evitata rotis, palmaque nobilis / terrarum dominos evehit ad deos," it may be added, in view of the unhelpfulness of editions on this point, that *nobilis* is not nom. sing. but acc. plur. and qualifies *dominos* (cf. 1. 12. 25-27, 4. 2. 17-18; Sen. *Thy.* 409-10). However, we may assume that, if the traditional reading is right, Horace decided to write *Olympicum* in verse 3 and not *Olympico* (for which 4. 3. 4-6; Verg. *Georg.* 1. 59; Prop. 3. 9. 17; Amm. Marc. 29. 1. 25 might be compared), because he intended a rhyme with the two halves of the preceding verse, just as *fervidis* in the next line rhymes with the two halves of verse 5.

But these are remarks made at random. Marouzeau's collected essays remind us how indefatigably devoted and uniformly stimulating his work has been during the last forty years on various aspects of one of his favorite themes; and, in thus assembling and editing his articles for our convenience, he has provided the second edition of *Traité de stylistique latine* with a worthy companion and rendered yet another major service to Latin studies.

ROBERT J. GETTY

University of Toronto

*Die Dichtkunst Virgils: Bild und Symbol in der Äneis.* By VIKTOR PÖSCHL. Innsbruck and Vienna: Margarete Friedrich Rohrer Verlag, 1950. Pp. 288 + frontispiece. \$2.50.

The author of this remarkable book has read the *Aeneid* with immense sensitivity and affection. He handsomely accomplishes his purpose of examining the extent to which the fundamental themes of the epic and the characters and destinies of its leading figures are symbolically expressed and of determining the aesthetic principles here in operation, and in the process not only furnishes a fresh and true interpretation of the *Aeneid* in its essence and grand outlines, but illuminates countless individual passages which have been neglected or misunderstood owing to failure to perceive their symbolic significance. His work should do much to help the rest of us become better readers of the poem.

Virgil is the first European to compose poetry which is consciously symbolic. This awareness of the expressive value of form, of the indissolubility of form and content, makes the *Aeneid* classical in a sense that the *Iliad* is not. In the Homeric poems, as in all poetry, there is much that is symbolic, but, unlike Virgil, Homer is symbolic *malgré lui* (p. 5). Philological criticism of the *Aeneid*, from Servius' day to the present, has been in the main blind to this prime characteristic of Virgil as artist, and has judged the poem by literal and rationalistic criteria rather than by formal and aesthetic ones. This, it is remarked, has been especially true in German-speaking countries; even so distinguished a Virgilian as Heinze, as the author repeatedly demonstrates, was often misled by his rationalistic approach, and in the cases of Dido and Turnus, thereby prevented from understanding the personal tragedies of these heroic figures.

The *Aeneid*, the prototype of a whole series of similar transformations in western poetry, is conspicuous by virtue of Virgil's unique ability to take over thoughts and images already formed and by skilful use of their symbolic potentialities to make them his own (p. 16). The great source for these thoughts and images is of course the Homeric poems, and the author recognizes that "the best method to penetrate the secrets of Virgil's art is that of comparison

with Homer, whom the poet challenges in almost every verse. The confrontation of co-ordinate forms is invariably the most effectual means of understanding the individual essence of creations of the spirit" (p. 14). That a close relation existed between Virgil and Homer was of course apparent to ancient *grammatici*, as Gellius and Macrobius attest, but they seem to have had small understanding of or curiosity about its nature. The great Renaissance critic Julius Caesar Scaliger devoted the third chapter of the fifth book of his *Poetice* to a spirited "Homeri et Virgilii locorum collatio: quae ad LIX columnas extenditur" (table of contents of the 1581 edition) where a great number of "parallel passages" are commented upon in a manner seldom favorable to the Greek poet. Many of JCS's animadversions indicate that he intuitively felt the emotional difference between the two poets, but he is never explicit on this head, and indeed is more concerned to proclaim the superiorities of Virgil, whom he regards as a fellow countryman, than to consider in what respects he differs from his predecessor. Now a cardinal difference, the author points out, between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* on the one hand and the *Aeneid* on the other is the shift of emphasis in the Roman poem from the external to the inner existence of the actors. "The plasticity of the Homeric style ... is graphically and musically broken up and infused with emotion. ... Everything becomes an indication of the soul. Landscape, morning, evening and night, clothing and arms, every gesture, motion, image, the cadence of every verse is permeated with a spiritual fluid and incorporated into the emotional climate of the poem" (pp. 8-9).

The "Durchseelung" of Virgilian poetry has been recognized by recent critics and doubtless felt from time immemorial; however the delicate task of examining this phenomenon in detail has not heretofore been attempted for the *Aeneid*. The author separates his treatment into three principal divisions: in the first he considers the symbolism with which the fundamental

themes of the poem are expressed, and analyzes *Aen.* 1. 8–296 as a symbolic foreshadowing of the poem in its entirety (pp. 23–41), then goes on to show how the initial groups of scenes of the first book symbolically introduce the Odyssean half of the poem, while those with which the seventh book begins serve a similar function for the half which corresponds to the *Iliad*; in the second division (pp. 57–227) he discusses and elucidates the complex and often extremely subtle use of symbols in setting forth the character and fate of Aeneas, Dido, and Turnus. Finally, under the heading “aesthetic principles,” the symbolism of what may be called the “emotional continuity” (*Gefühlsablauf*) of the poem is scrutinized, together with the forms in which this emotional continuity manifests itself (pp. 228–82).

“The first group of scenes of the *Aeneid* contains in *nuce* all the forces which go to make up the entire work” (p. 41). Not only does the tempest with which the poem begins set the emotional keynote, but like an operatic overture the scenes dominated by the storm at sea suggest the basic motives of the poem. Juno’s hatred for Aeneas foreshadows the great struggle between Rome and Carthage, while the goddess herself is the divine symbol of the demonic powers of passion, darkness and destruction which are opposed and subdued by the forces of order and serenity which constitute the Roman ideal, an ideal symbolized by Jupiter, Aeneas, and Augustus. The theme of pacification appears in the control exercised by Aeolus over the winds, recurs more vividly in the calming of the tempest by Neptune, is emphasized in the famous *sedition* comparison of 1. 148ff. and culminates with 1. 295ff. where *Furor impius* is finally imprisoned in chains behind the closed gates of war, “the greatest instance in the *Aeneid* of the symbolic summarizing of a historical occurrence in an image” (p. 32). This struggle to subdue the demonic is the essential theme of the poem; it recurs constantly in the most varied forms: “the demonic appears on the historical plane as civil strife and war, as

passion on that of the soul, as destruction and death on the plane of nature. Jupiter, Aeneas, and Augustus are the subduers of the demonic, whereas Juno, Dido, Turnus, and Antony are its vanquished personifications” (p. 31). The author wisely cautions against the oversimplification of an allegorical interpretation: “a symbol permits, indeed calls for, more than one interpretation; an allegory is limited to one” (p. 37), and continues, “the tragic element of the *Aeneid* is not merely a symbol of the tragic in Roman history, but also of the tragic in human life, indeed of the tragic in all nature” (p. 40).

From his first appearance Aeneas stands out as a symbol of the emotional climate of the period between the agonies of the civil wars and the establishment of the *pax Augusta*. Unlike Odysseus, who is predominantly concerned with the moment at hand, his thoughts are turned toward either the past or the future; it is the recollection of the past glories of Troy that gives him the strength to persevere in his mission (p. 61). Even in the opening scene when he is on the verge of being swept to his death in the tempest he thinks back to Troy; once ashore he sustains his companions with hope for the future. This consciousness of tradition and of what lies ahead goes hand in hand with the Roman sense of duty toward gods, country, forefathers and descendants, that is to say, *pietas*, of which it is remarked with fine insight that it lacks the acrid overtones that we associate with “duty,” for it is motivated not by the intellect but by love (p. 67).

The Heinzean view of Aeneas’ Stoicism is shown to be untenable, at least if the term is understood in its strict sense. “The hero feels sorrow in his soul to the uttermost degree; his moral effort is never directed toward attaining insensibility, but despite the greatest emotional suffering toward carrying out what he is required to do” (p. 89). This suffering “is less sorrow at his own lost or renounced happiness than spiritual distress arising from sympathy, from grief that others must suffer so bitterly from the fulfillment of orders



which destiny has enjoined upon him" (p. 88). Herein lies the poignancy of 4. 449: "mens immota manet, lacrimae voluntur inanes" (the tears must be those of Aeneas alone, as St. Augustine understood; the symbolism leaves tears implicit in verse 444 further supports this interpretation, for the tree from which the leaves fall stands in the comparison for Aeneas). There may be a connection between the trials Aeneas undergoes and the Stoic notion of *exercitatio*, but Aeneas has little in common with the wise man of the Stoics; such a figure would be poetically catastrophic (p. 94). No sounder is the theory, also advanced by Heinze, that Aeneas' character shows development. As his mission becomes more and more clear to him, Aeneas becomes less baffled and surer of himself, but his essential nature, which is characterized by the conflict in his heart between duty and human sensibility, remains the same from the beginning to the end of the poem (pp. 96-97).

Dido makes her first appearance in 1. 496. *Pulcherrima*, surrounded by young men, she arrives at the temple of Juno. The mood of the scene is happy and confident, in ominous contrast to the grim destiny which awaits the queen. She advances like Diana attended by her nymphs:

qualis in Eurotae ripis aut per iuga Cynthi  
exercent Diana choros, quam mille secutae  
hinc atque hinc glomerantur Oreades; illa  
pharetram  
fert umero gradiensque deas supereminet  
omnis,

Latonae tacitum pertemptant gaudia pectus  
[498-502].

These verses, which derive from *Od.* 6. 162ff. where Nausicaa and her handmaids tossing a ball are compared to Artemis with her nymphs, have been censured by almost every critic (Probus, Sainte-Beuve, Ribbeck, Heinze, Cartault) as an inappropriate and unfortunate example of Virgilian borrowing. The author's defense of this passage, in which he brings out the richness and subtlety of its symbolic content, is an excellent illustration of his method. He makes, among others, the following

observations; in both comparisons the emphasis is on the beauty of the goddess, not on the action; Dido's entry is not portentously solemn, which disposes of the traditional objection that the dance of Diana and the nymphs is out of keeping with the gravity of Dido's approach; the Virgilian passage, furthermore, is not a mere replica of the Homeric one, for while Artemis plays together with her nymphs, Diana supervises and directs hers, thus suggesting Dido "instans operi regnisque futuris" (504); the carefree sport of the *Odyssey* has become a ceremonial dance (the scene has changed to the banks of the Eurotas and to Delos, centers of worship of the goddess); Dido does not simply enter the temple, she goes about inspecting the work under way (the phrase "hinc atque hinc glomerantur Oreades" of the comparison points toward the groups of builders that cluster around her as she examines various parts of the structure); finally the comparison "not only exalts Dido but gives the entire activity at the temple a glint of poetry" (p. 107). This is not all. A significant difference is that while Odysseus did not witness Nausicaa's play, Aeneas watches Dido arrive. The Virgilian comparison reflects his inner reaction to what he sees; it contains the germ of the love prepared by the words of Venus in 1. 335ff (p. 108 and n. 1). The first tremors of this love are hinted by "pertemptant gaudia pectus"; *pertemptant* has no counterpart in the Homeric simile; its implication is erotic, as Cerda perceived. The author quotes the remarks of the old scholar comparing *Georg.* 3. 250, where this meaning is explicit, with a measure of approval (p. 111, n. 1).

Notable are the pages (119ff.) which explain Dido's death as resulting from the combination of her character and the situation in which she finds herself, rather than from the situation in itself, as Heinze believed. No less so is the entire treatment of Turnus (pp. 153-227). Even were there space to attempt a summary, it would be hard to do so without distortion, for the author makes his points succinctly. It

must suffice to say that the disparaging view of this dauntless and unhappy warrior held by Heinze and others (on p. 158 n. 1 there is a quotation from W. Ehlers' unpublished *Real-Encyclopädie* article s.v. "Turnus," to the effect that it is a modern aberration to consider the Rutulian a tragic hero rather than an enemy of the State, a view which would appear to have lost its timeliness) is thoroughly refuted. "The deep, consuming sorrow for the loss of honor and of victory . . . gives his destiny too the sombre effulgence of pure tragedy. Something of the greatness of Achilles has passed over into him, and it has required much prejudice to prevent this having been recognized and the tragic power of the second half of the *Aeneid*, which is inextricably bound up with the figure of Turnus, properly appreciated" (p. 227).

The last division discusses the symbolism and forms of the "emotional continuity" or "sequence of emotions" characteristic of Virgil's poetry. Servius (*Aen.* 11. 183) quotes Asinius Pollio as having remarked that in his descriptions of day-break the poet regularly used expressions appropriate to the situation. This harmony between description and situation, it is advanced, goes much farther than Pollio realized; it holds good for Virgilian descriptions generally. In particular, almost all comparisons are closely related to the inner, emotional "action" of the poem. Apropos of this it is observed that the simile of the ants (4. 401 ff.) "for which neither Homer nor Apollonius provides a model [the ants themselves are surely a reminiscence of *Argon.* 4. 1452] does not merely, in a Homeric and circumstantial manner, represent the preparations for Aeneas' departure, but in its murky coloring and dragging heaviness symbolizes Dido's mood as she watches these activities, just as the comparison with Diana [see above] not only describes Dido's appearance but reveals the emotions of Aeneas" (p. 230). Again in the description of Mercury's voyage (4. 246 ff.) "Atlas is a symbol of the cruelty of the gods and the grimness of fate, as well as an illustration

of the destiny that hangs over human beings, which is soon in Dido's case to be fulfilled without mercy" (p. 237). It should be noted that the perplexing words "lumina morte resignat" (4. 244), which are quoted but not translated must have to do with Mercury as bringer of death, since they form the climax of a description darkly forboding the death of the queen (p. 238). How rewarding sensitivity for the symbolism of descriptions may be is shown by the interpretation of the scenes decorating the temple of Daedalus (6. 14 ff.) as symbols of the destiny of Aeneas: both heroes knew the bitterness of exile; the allusion to Ariadne in 6. 28 recalls the love and pity of Aeneas for Dido; the attachment of Daedalus to his son parallels the relation between Aeneas and Anchises (p. 246). Finally the analysis of the symbolic, almost mystic meaning of the song of Iopas (pp. 247-53) is a wonderful example of critical insight.

Books like this seldom appear. When one does, it is a stroke of good fortune for those who take pleasure in Latin poetry.<sup>1</sup>

RICHARD T. BRÜERE

*University of Chicago*

*Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* By ALOIS WALDE and J. B. HOFMANN. 3d ed. Lieferung 16 (*praeditus-rēx*). Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1950. Pp. 353-432. DM 4.20.

Page 432 ends in the middle of *rēx*, roughly halfway through volume 2, without indices. At the present rate of progress, in five years more the revision of Walde will be complete. It is reported, however, that J. B. Hofmann, about to be retired from his post with *TLL*, will be in need of

1. A few additions should be made to the *errata* listed on p. 287. The reference on p. 108, n. 1 should be *Aen.* 1. 335 ff., that just preceding n. 1 on p. 142, *Ecl.* 8. 60. In the quotation from the *Heautontimouromenos* (p. 118, n. 31) "humani" should come before "nihil"; the decorations of the temple of Juno are paintings (*Aen.* 1. 464) not reliefs, as is stated on pp. 20, 61, and 242. There are misprints in the Latin on p. 131, last line; p. 162, l. 7; p. 236, l. 10; p. 247, l. 5 from bottom; p. 279, l. 6 from bottom. Finally the page reference in the index s.v. "Lucan" should be corrected to 171.

support of which, it is suggested, all of those who wish to see his Latin etymological dictionary finished will not wish him deprived. Such well-wishers may appropriately make known their views to the secretaries of the societies, APA or LSA or MLA or other, of which they happen to be members, in order that action already taken, or about to be taken, may be strengthened. It would be a misfortune if, from *rēx* to *zonatim* (or whatever Hofmann's last word may be), the second edition of Walde, now over thirty years old, is left unrevised by Hofmann who has all the material at his finger-tips.

General comments and criticisms of Walde-Hofmann are at this date unnecessary, except to observe that references to previous items become more numerous as the work progresses, especially in the etymologies of compounds (e.g., with *prae-*), which in like measure makes further discussion now also unnecessary. A few particular remarks are not out of place.

In *praeputium* (pp. 354-55; cf. also under *pūbēs* p. 381) *-putium* is far less likely to be from an imaginary *\*pūtos* "penis," than either "skin" or "hood." The latter is suggested by *cucutium* which has both meanings (any representation of the Genius Cucullatus, e.g., Cook's *Zeus*, II, 1089-90, cf. *DAG* 178, s.v. "cucullus," will bring out the point). Perhaps for *prae-c-* (like *prope* for *\*pro-que*), and so from the root (s)*qey-* (W-P, II, 549). On p. 355 for *salaputiam* read *salaputium* (better *-tt-*), which, according to Hofmann, "bleibt fern." Of *praeputium* Hofmann writes "seit Varro," but does not give the reference; it is, as I learn from the Editor of *CP*, Sen. *Apocol.* 8. 1: "ut ait Varro 'sine capite, sine praeputio.'" In the corresponding Greek term ἀρχεβυστίξ the second element of the compound is commonly supposed to be Semitic (Bab. *buštu* "pudenda").

At *prō* (p. 365) for the by-form *\*prōd* cf. VL *prode*, *\*prodis* (M-L 6766), whence "prude" (properly "able, capable, gallant"; then "discreet," both m. and f.).

Vergil (*Georg* 2.26; *Aen.* 6.870) appears to distinguish *prōpago* and *prōpago* (p. 371) in the literal and metaphorical sense.

The etymology of *proelium* (p. 369) remains a riddle; but is the old guess (: *bellum*, i.e., *-dy-* medially giving *-u-* afterwards lost), so far out? The notion of single combat is by no means excluded; *perduellio* has *u*, not *y*.

P. 372. — *properus*: cf. ἔμπειρος, Toch. *B empre* "true," for the formation.

If *tripudium* really goes with *pudet* (p. 381), it is difficult to dissociate also Umb. *tribrišu*, which is admittedly connected with *pēs*.

P. 382. — *-por* (s.v. "puer"), e.g., *Mar-cipor*. But there are some names ending in *-por* (notably in *CIL*, III) of different formation which suggest Thracian *-poris*.

P. 383. — s.v. "pugil," "pungo." The Lucretian *tempore puncto* might have been added here.

P. 384. — s.v. "pulcher." Vergil's use in the sense "parti-colored, variegated" (*Georg* 2.463) suggests that he knew the association with Greek χρώς "color," contained in the S. Italic gloss πολλαχρόν καλόν, which would account for the spelling *-ch-*.

P. 391. — For Goth. *funius* (gen. of *fōn*) read *funins*.

P. 393. — *putare* "think." The transition from the original meaning "prune" would seem to have come through *rationes putare* "reckon," an accountant's or banker's metaphor, literally "clean up, i.e., balance the debit and credit accounts," notwithstanding *cernere* "cut," for that is "decide," not merely "think."

P. 395. — Add Gaulish *petuar[ios]* (*DAG*, 96) from La Graufesenque; this important form does not appear at p. 401 either, though Hofmann has it on p. 399.

On p. 398 add *quaquara* "coturnix" from Festus (see *Gloss. Lat.*, IV [1930], 137, after my Schol. Vallicell. 12.161).

P. 401. — On *-tt-* in *quattuor* see Kent, *Language*, III (1927), 12-14 (analogical *-ā-*, popular *-ātt-*).

P. 402. — If *queo* is to be derived from *\*quei*, then (so it is said) there is an exact

parallel in Chinese. Latin *nequam*, *nequitiae* perhaps point in the same direction (cf. *nequeo*).

P. 403. — *s.v.* "quercus." Cf. the divine name *Percernes* (*DAG*, 82) and (in Spain, see *AcS*, II., 1060) *Querquerni* (*Quar-*), *Aquae Querquernae*.

P. 408. — On *quinq(u)atrus* (and also on Osc. *pumperias* ("Nones"?) cf. *HSCP*, XLII (1931), 168–69.

P. 414. — On *rac(h)ana* (Germanic?) see now *DAG*, 220; and (p. 415) on *raia* *ibid.*, p. 207.

P. 420. — Add (*s.v.* "raudus") *PID*, II, 163–64 *Campi Raudii*.

But I forbear. I am not writing a Latin etymological dictionary myself. Walde-Hofmann is useful far more for its citation of opinions than for independence of judgment in disputed questions; and, for all his industry, I find I can usually glean even where Hofmann has reused.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker.* By KARL SCHEFOLD. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co., 1943. Pp. 228. Swiss fr. 32.

*Das hellenistische Bildnis.* By ERNST BÜSCHOR. München: Biederstein Verlag, 1949. Pp. 71 + 16 pls. DM 12.

Two new books on Greek and Roman portraiture, different in scope, purpose, and presentation, have in common that both reveal the intrinsic problems of this part of Classical Art once again. There is hardly another field in Art History as little clarified and as hotly debated; many questions raised may very well prove unanswerable, some basic problems involved seem to be insoluble. In dealing with books on ancient portraits, even more in reviewing them, it must be remembered that portraiture offers two opposite approaches: the iconographic and the stylistic. The interest in the person a portrait represents, and the attempt to evaluate a portrait as a work of art are not easily combined, all

the more so as experience shows how often we are tempted to appreciate the quality of an apparently excellent likeness in an artistically poor work, or vice versa, to praise the artistic value of a piece which can hardly be called a portrait proper. Such distinctions, to be sure, are mere mistakes, but they indicate the degree of difficulty in dealing with an art species where the old questions of "form," "content," and "message" appear trickiest. There is not even a commonly accepted definition of what a portrait is and is not, nor is there an agreement of what it ought to achieve in order to be a success. To these difficulties ancient portraiture adds its own special ones. No Greek original portrait can be identified — all preserved portraits of famous Greeks are Roman copies and therefore only adaptations changing the lost original to some extent, sometimes possibly to the degree of a downright falsification. Consequently our system of dating is largely built upon stylistically unreliable works — it is therefore inevitable that a large number of works are variously assigned to different centuries (so it is, for instance, in the case of the "Menander-Vergil" and the Pseudo-Seneca, to mention two cases where we have dozens of copies, or in that of the "Hellenistic Ruler," which is an example of an original).

Thus the critic of books on ancient portraiture is compelled either to examine every single work cited and to put forward his own reasons and opinions at length, or to take a more general view of, say, the overall aspects and the underlying ideas the books in question offer. Here only the latter alternative is followed.

Schefold sets out to combine the iconographic approach (which the title of his book reveals as his chief purpose) with the stylistic one. For the first time the portraits of ancient "intellectuals" are not dealt with according to their life dates from Homer down, but are organized according to the epochs to which the portraits belong. So the illustrations begin with sixth century vases representing

Anacreon, and the Homer heads are separated from each other. It is clear that Schefold uses the word "Bildnis" in a very broad sense indeed, but this usage proves to be much more adequate in dealing with Greek art than a narrower one would be which inevitably would have led him into the hot water of defining "the" Greek portrait "proper." "Bildnis" might be translated by "image" rather than "portrait." But thus escaping one difficulty he at once is confronted with another: how to deal properly with copies? Wisely he refrains from being logically consistent: all those copies he considers fairly faithful he accepts, as it were, as genuine works of the epoch of the respective original, the remaining ones he puts together under the head "Classicism." This term however is equivocal, at least in such context; the reader probably is expected to understand it in a very general sense. The author's principle of selection seems to me more doubtful. It includes all identified portraits or images of Greek and Roman poets, orators, and philosophers except the new Cato found after the publication of the book, and a large number of those whose identity we do not know. In many of these cases scholars have made various attempts at identification; Schefold in such cases cautiously adds a question mark. This way of presentation is not without danger: it may lead the layman, even the well educated one, to the false conclusion that these identifications are more or less generally accepted. But just the opposite is true. (For instance, I do not think that Miss Bieber's idea of identifying the Pseudo-Seneca as "Aristophanes" has met with general approval.) I would therefore have preferred to mention those identifications in the appendix instead of using them as titles of the plates. This detail is not as unimportant as it seems, for it turns out that Schefold has excluded most of those works for which no identification has been suggested although no one doubted that they are portraits of "Greek intellectuals." (Examples at random: statuette of a philosopher from Pompei in Naples [Levi,

*Terracotte*, pl. 12]; the famous statue of a philosopher in Delphi; the bronze portrait of a philosopher from Anticythera in Athens — to mention only works of outstanding quality.) It might be asked whether the purpose of the book would not have been better served by selecting the best works available and sacrificing others included mainly because they seemed to be identified but in fact are not.

Apart from this possible criticism I do not doubt that every one interested in the subject will be very grateful indeed for this first collection of excellently printed plates representing the respective images in a better and more complete form than any previous book. Even higher praise has to be rendered to the organization of the text. It is easy to write a book for scholarly use only, and the quantity of "popular" books on art demonstrates only too clearly that there are enough writers who turn out books without any scholarly pretension whatsoever — publications, that are both learned and readable, are deplorably rare. Schefold succeeds in being both, through dividing his text into three main parts: a general introduction, extensive interpretations accompanying the plates, and an appendix where the scholar can find the evidence on which introduction and interpretation are based, together with a full record of pertinent ancient and modern literature. It is of course the appendix with which archeologists might argue most in many points, but the introduction is of far greater significance. All peculiarities of Greek portraiture are dealt with (such as the significance of the portrait statue as opposed to the portrait head, and its origin, and the relationships between reality and art, history and myth, idealism and individualism). I do not know whether that could have been done better in so short an introduction but I admit that in my opinion the terms used sometimes seemed to need more clarification or should have been more narrowly defined. If, for instance, the Greek portraitists wanted only "to grasp the essence of the appearance," or if Greek portraiture is "a part of



a peculiarly mythical concept of great men which as such is a part of the Greek concept of Nature" — and both statements are to a great extent meaningful for and acceptable to this reviewer — we must ask at once what the "essence" actually means and what that Greek concept of Nature actually was. There is a danger in using such language and avoiding going deeper into the problems involved. However, what that had implied we have already indicated — it would not be fair to hold it against Schefold that he did not attempt to tackle those problems. As a whole this introduction is one of the best essays on ancient portraiture I know of, at once informative and stimulating.

Buschor's small book is written for fellow archeologists, but being written by Buschor it is quite different from usual learned publications. Its aim is purely stylistic: what Buschor sets out to do is to offer a history of Hellenistic portraiture from Alexander to Augustus. The author states his purpose of "relating almost 400 sculptures to each other" and of building up "a scheme of development." Since this is done in only sixty-one pages, the author had to put forward his opinions somewhat concisely. The monuments, he says, are "forced to speak for themselves" and "as a totality to prove their organic structure." Thus what the book offers is one archeologist's conception of Hellenistic portraiture as a whole rather than his opinions in a number of controversial cases. In view of the present situation in the field of ancient portraiture such an attempt can be of much greater value than the usual, and safer, way of dealing with the subject; since the book is written by one of the truly great historians of ancient art its value is beyond question. Before arguing with a Buschor's "scheme" we have to think more than twice. Even then we have to appreciate its challenge which is not an ordinary one.

To this reviewer one comment of the author seemed particularly provocative: it is implied in his dealing with Italic and Roman works. On page fourteen the so-called "Brutus" is mentioned as an Italic

original which "in its manner introduces us into the force and purity of this world," i.e., that of early Hellenistic portraiture. There is no mention of the other works of Italic portraiture (such as the Florentine boy, the bronze head in Paris, etc.), nor is there any remark on their relationship with the Italic canopi. On page thirty-eight the Arringatore is called an "Etruscan imitation," i.e., of a Greek original or, at least, of the "style" of Greek portraiture of around 100 B.C. The last twenty pages are devoted to portraiture of the first century B.C. A number of heads usually called Roman Republican and strictly distinguished from late Hellenistic works appear here very closely connected with Greek portraits; some are "Greek works representing Romans" (for instance the so-called Aulus Postumius or Lucullus, who consequently is linked with the Delos portraits), some are members of an otherwise purely Greek group (for instance the Pompeius portraits and the so-called "Sulla"), some are mere "provincial" Italic adaptations (e.g., the Berlin head from Palestrina); thus genuine Roman portraiture is restricted, at least until the middle of the first century, to Roman gravestones and other similarly poor works. Even for later times it is stated that "the Romans made the Greeks represent their great men." Buschor introduces "ateliers in South Italy and Sicily" beside those in Greece, the Greek islands, Asia Minor, and Alexandria. "It is not justifiable to be silent about those Greeks (i.e., from Magna Graecia) or to characterize their works as Roman" (p. 51) and "genuine friends of true *Romanitas* will turn from these Greek portraits and even from Italo-Greek works and border cases and will rather give their attention to Roman grave sculpture and its related forms" (p. 54). In these two sentences Buschor's opinions are most clearly stated. Consequently what we usually regard as Roman portraiture is now divided into (1) genuine Greek works, (2) Greek works from Magna Graecia, (3) Roman works. Among the third there is, as far as I can see, only one work of higher

quality: a head in Munich. The Augustus of Prima Porta as well as the bronze head of Augustus in the Vatican are believed to be examples of the second group to which a large number of other Roman heads also are said to belong. The Boston Augustus is purely Greek, as is the newly found head of Augustus in Naples.

I cannot believe that many archeologists will follow Buschor in this part of his thesis. We still know hardly anything about first century Magna Graecia — Buschor does not give new evidence for his ascriptions. Emphasizing the Greek origin of many artists working in Rome leads to distortion rather than to clarification of a highly complicated situation. American art, for example, is not European even if many artists are European born, nor is truly American Art that of the Navajos or that of Grandma Moses. Kaschnitz, among others, has demonstrated that there was original Italic portraiture, the artistic structure of which is very different indeed from the Greek. Nobody has ever denied that Greek — Hellenistic and classic — patterns have contributed to the establishment of Roman art, in fact it is through this "influence" that Roman art ceased to be a branch of Italic art and became Roman. It is one of the most important tasks of classical archeology to analyse this complicated aspect of Roman art. Schweitzer in his new book on Roman Republican portraiture tried to do precisely this. He, it seemed to me (see my review in *Gnomon*, XXII [1950], 321–34) somehow underrated the Greek contribution. How controversial the matter still is Buschor's book has proved again. Moreover his book prevents us from leaving the problem alone. We all have to be grateful that it will force us to fight things out. Just recently a very important contribution to the problem of the Italic and the Greek structure in Roman portraiture has been published by Guido Kaschnitz-Weinberg in *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, III (1950), 148–88.

PETER H. V. BLANCKENHAGEN  
University of Chicago

*La Vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollio*. By J. ANDRÉ. ("Études et commentaires," No. VIII.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1949. Pp. 139.

Monographs like this, when properly done, are not only informative but good reading. The author, who has resolved a number of problems concerning Asinius Pollio in several recent articles, here expands his researches into a comprehensive and scholarly account of this striking and frequently misjudged figure.

It is demonstrated that, contrary to prevailing opinion, the *Propempticon* dedicated to Pollio by C. Helvius Cinna has to do with a voyage to Greece made by the former in 56 B.C., not with the campaign of 40–39 against the Parthini (p. 11); the view that Pollio held a tribunate in 47 is also successfully refuted.

In the chapter on Pollio as poet the much debated "Pollio et ipse facit nova carmina" (*Ecl.* 3. 86) is interpreted to mean "Pollion aussi fait des vers comme les nôtres," i.e., that while Pollio was residing near Virgil in Cisalpine Gaul he was attracted by the *genre* Virgil was developing from the Theocritean pastoral, and tried his hand at this type of verse (pp. 34–35). It might be mentioned that Virgil speaks of Pollio as being engaged in composing "nova carmina" but furnishes no proof that he ever completed or published verse of this nature. With regard to Pollio's tragedies, the author reasonably concludes that they were actually performed (p. 39).

The problem of the scope of Pollio's *History* is examined carefully and in detail (pp. 44–50). The author believes that the work ended with Philippi. Nevertheless this reviewer still regards Kornemann's hypothesis that the account extended to the ending of civil warfare after Actium as the most probable one. The first ode of Horace's second book is our most important evidence for the scope of the *History*. The date of composition of the ode is here irrelevant; the significant point is that when it was placed in the prominent initial position of the book upon the publication of *Carm.* 1–3 in 23 B.C., the "incedis per ignis/suppositos cineri doloso" (7–8) would

suggest to the contemporary Roman the entire period of civil war, and particularly its later phases, for Pollio's known friendship for Antony would make the conflict between Antony and Octavian a most delicate subject for him. By this time Horace must have had a pretty exact notion of the ground Pollio meant to cover, and presumably would not have expressed warnings that would naturally be understood to refer to the latter part of the conflict if the historian had not made clear his intention of telling the complete story. In addition, it is hardly likely that Pollio, not an unduly modest man, would have omitted his own consulship and his Dalmatian campaign and triumph. Finally the passage of Pollio cited by Priscian (*GLK*, II, 386. 9) which refers either to 38 or 34 B.C. has every earmark of having been taken from a historical composition. André's contention that since Pollio's history ends with 42 B.C. it cannot form part of the work (p. 61) is merely a *petitio principii*.

Pollio as critic is ably discussed. In particular, it is emphasized that although Pollio was temperamentally antipathetic to Cicero and well aware of the defects of the great orator, he nevertheless judged him with much greater fairness than has commonly been supposed both in ancient and modern times (pp. 94-98).

Finally the author inclines, with J. Whatmough,<sup>1</sup> to regard the famous *patavinitas* with which Pollio reproached Livy as a matter of phonetics.

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

*Hesiod and Aeschylus*. By FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN. ("Cornell University Studies in Classical Philology," Vol. XXX.) Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1949. Pp. x + 230. \$3.00.

1. The 1933 *HSCP* article in which Whatmough set forth his views is cited correctly by volume and page both times it is mentioned, but in the first instance (p. 92, n. 1) is ascribed to the *Classical Journal*, in the second (p. 135), to *Classical Philology*.

The subjects dealt with in the classics are so well known that they have almost become metaphorical. It is one of the most urgent tasks of modern philology to give them back their original value, to see them in the light of their own days. The author of the present book shows what Hesiod's poems meant when they were first recited. It was the discovery of the eternal validity of morals, so to speak, not so much in their individual as in their social aspect. Professor Solmsen is admirably acquainted with the widespread discussions of Hesiod's poems, and his cautious judgment on the questionable points is sound and reliable. (The short but brilliant remarks in Jaeger's Gifford Lectures, *Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (1947), pp. 10ff., were probably still unknown to him when he wrote his book.)

By taking the new deities and their grouping in the *Theogony* seriously as a form of thought which, of course, is on the way to abstractions but has not yet reached them, he succeeds in making visible the inner connection between the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*, which witnesses, at the same time, the progress of the poet. I should go even a little further than he does. If he argues that the abrupt change from one image to the other shows "that each of them possesses for Hesiod symbolic, not literal value" (p. 94), I should ask to what extent this distinction, natural as it seems to us, was already present to the minds of the seventh century B.C. To give one more instance: The idea of omnipresence is common to every modern man. The Greeks of Homeric times were able to conceive it in the case of the Sun, whose rays are there all the day. But when absent or sleeping, the gods of the *Iliad* do not notice what happens on earth. Hence, the famous passage of the thirty thousand guardians of Zeus who watch mankind. It seems no adequate statement that this is a symbol for the omnipresence of Zeus rather than an attempt to explain how Zeus sees everything in spite of the fact that the idea of omnipresence has not yet been realized. The

difference seems a slight one, and yet it is only in this way that we can hope to discover the slow and toilsome progress of the human mind.

On the other hand, Solmsen seems to me sometimes to underrate the influence of Hesiod's surroundings on his thought, perhaps in a sound reaction against certain positivist methods of research. He never mentions Boeotian cults, and yet these cults, the festivals of the country, the holy wells and trees were realities to the poet. Unfortunately, with the single exception of the Eros of Thespias, the interpreters of Hesiod have hardly cared for Boeotian religious traditions. Excavations in this part of Greece have hitherto yielded little result for the seventh century. But cautious inferences from later times and a careful analysis of the myths may teach us what Hesiod overcame. Also we may ask how far Hesiod reflects the general trend of his age. Dike was represented on the Kypselos chest, and it is highly improbable that her presence there has anything to do with Hesiod. In other words, is it he who started the movement for justice which culminates in Greek cities in the demand for written laws, or is he only a representative of an extensive movement? Again, Hesiod is to us the most impressive prophet of the might of Zeus. But in the eighth book of the *Iliad* there is an outspoken (though generally unobserved) tendency to enhance the might of the god, not only in his own speeches at the beginning, but also when Poseidon, contrary to the rest of the *Iliad*, acts as his servant. The question whether the author of the book knew Hesiod can be left aside, for the moral element, the real Hesiodic element, is absent. Again, we learn that the religious movement, which changed the Homeric king of the gods into a supreme ruler of the world, had still other roots than the speculation of a single poet. All this does not alter Solmsen's conclusions but may show a way in which they might be supplemented.

On the second part of the book I can be more brief. Solmsen shows there the trend

which leads from Hesiod to the poems of Solon and to Aeschylus, especially to the *Prometheus* and the *Eumenides*. He states that Solon depends on Hesiod, though I should stress the fact that justice with him is always an "abstract" which has none of the vivid colors in which her person is depicted in Hesiod. The next stage is Aeschylus. In the *Prometheus* he makes a free use of the Hesiodic myth. The problem which is raised by the contrast between this picture of Zeus and that in the rest of his plays, the author, following Wilamowitz, tries to solve by the expedient that the god develops from the tyrant of his youth to the wise and fatherly governor of the world in the poet's own days. However, it seems doubtful whether this explanation does not anticipate modern ideas; Aeschylus was in the first place a dramatist, and Zeus as a person in his plays necessarily took other features than as an object of the prayers of his chorus or of himself. Furthermore, I am not certain that Solmsen's attempt to harmonize the *Prometheus* and the *Eumenides* as well as the rest of his plays, alluring as it seems, is right. The *Eumenides* may well represent, as he says (p. 222), a synthesis between the religious and the political aspect of justice. It is a beautiful interpretation of the play that blood feuds may only come to final appeasement in the lawful atmosphere of the state, but the idea is too abstract to account for all the difficulties in the second part of the *Eumenides*. I should think that an explanation from the artistic point of view might furnish us with a better explanation for the inconsistencies. Aeschylus was, after all, a great poet and a man of deep religious feeling, but no philosopher and no theologian. As a whole, the book is rich in ideas and its suggestions give a valuable contribution towards a real understanding of the Greek archaic period.

K. LATTE

Göttingen

*T. Macci Plauti Rudens*. Edited by A. I. AMATUCCI. ("Corpus scriptorum latinorum Paravianum.") Torino: G. B. Paravia & Co., 1949. Pp. xvi + 103. L. 500.

In this edition of one of the best of Plautus' comedies Professor Amatucci has provided for us not only an inexpensive and readable text of the play but also an up-to-date critical *apparatus*; the *apparatus* partakes of the nature of a commentary, for the editor not infrequently gives his own views about the syntax, meter, or interpretation of difficult passages (cf., e.g., on 96, 122, 146, 149, 205, 418, 433, 577), views which, as he says in the *Praefatio* (p. v), he has developed from forty-five years of Plautine study.

Amatucci makes full use of earlier editions of the *Rudens*, including those of Marx (1928) and Ernout (1938), but does not hesitate to reject the suggestions of previous editors. He states that he has himself examined MSS ABD (p. vii) and ascribes rather less importance to the readings of A than do most modern editors (p. vi). He has accepted the evidence of T (the *codex Turnebi*) in several passages (e.g., 312-15 and 665-71), thus avoiding the unsightly asterisks found in many editions. In Palaestra's monody (185ff.) his own emendations are *hodie* (187), *iam* (196), and *compotis* (205); *ego*, which he reads in 191, is ascribed by Ernout to Mueller but was earlier suggested by Sonnenschein. Amatucci's own conjectures number more than twenty, the most attractive of which include the following: 237: *Palaestra[m audio]*, superior metrically to Lindsay's text; 457: *suppetit, subit, [subest]*, a typically Plautine triad (Amatucci compares *Trin.* 1118, and *Pers.* 331 might also be cited); 779: *dum . . . hoc tractabo*, perhaps the best interpretation of the remnants in A; 864: *tibin ne*, from *tibi une* of B (most editors read *tibi me* with CD), preferable as a question; 1061: *prior (pinor B; opinor CD*, which other editors accept).

As an editor Amatucci is conservative and follows wherever possible the reading of the MSS; e.g., 103: hiatus with most

editors, against Schoell and Marx; 146: *amorem* with the MSS, against the *amori* of other editors; 418: *mane mulierem*, with Sonnenschein (*editio minor*), following T, against Schoell, Lindsay, and Ernout; 709: *tunc* with the MSS, against *tun*, the reading of all modern editors; 859: hiatus with Leo and Lindsay, following the MSS; the emendations of Schoell and Marx seem unnecessary; 1248: *quom lusi (cum lusi*, Goetz-Schoell, Marx, Ernout), against *conlusim*, read by Sonnenschein (*editio minor*) and Lindsay; 1290: with Ernout; conjectures or lacunae of other editors unnecessary; 1383: the addition of *nihil* before *auferre* seems preferable to the more complicated emendations of Marx and Ernout.

The passages cited above will reveal, I trust, the quality of Amatucci's edition and its importance for future editors of Plautus, who will find much of interest and value in both his text and his critical comments. The book is attractively printed, and misprints are few. I have noticed only the following: p. ix, "quan," read "quam"; p. x, "*Syntaxis*," read "*Syntax*"; p. xiii, "Lyndsay," read "Lindsay"; p. 58 (on 779), "iatus," read "hiatus." Also, Miss Kurrelmeyer did not write *The Economy of Actors in Plautus* at the age of five; for "1909" (p. xiii) read "1929."

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH

Princeton University

*The Potters' Quarter*. By AGNES NEWHALL STILLWELL. (*Corinth: Results of the Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, VOL. XV, Part I.) Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1948. Pp. xi + 138 + 52 pls. \$10.00.

This is the first part of the final report on the Corinthian potters' quarter, one of the most fruitful excavations yet undertaken by the Americans at Corinth. Professor Rhys Carpenter first sank trial pits on this site in 1928, and it is a tribute to his foresight that serious excavation by the



School was begun the next year and entrusted to Mrs. Stillwell, whose competence is amply proved in this volume.

The excavated area lies on a hillside about a mile west of the Corinthian Agora (could we not have a sketch plan showing it in relation to other familiar landmarks?). As the author points out in the preface, it should perhaps be called a potters' quarter, since neither pottery with elaborate figure-scenes nor tiles seem to have been made there. (We already know, though the author curiously neglects to mention it, that a tile-factory, discovered just before the recent war, was located elsewhere, and that this factory produced vases too.) The present volume describes the excavations and buildings, stone blocks and sculpture, molds for figurines, and metal objects; the rest will follow in at least one more volume. The reader will do well to first consult the preliminary report in *AJA*, XXV (1931), pp. 1ff., which gives a good idea of the general nature and importance of the extraordinarily diverse materials which the site yielded.

The section on excavations and buildings contains the key to the whole stratigraphical and chronological system. The buildings were, for the most part, simple mud-brick shacks and enclosures, their rubble foundations alone surviving, and these much mutilated during the centuries the area was inhabited. It is a pity that the general plan has been reduced so greatly that the chronological key, which might have been most helpful, is in some places illegible, even with a glass; moreover, no levels are given. Fortunately, the author writes clearly and has wisely discussed the site by periods rather than by regions; the evidence is carefully set forth, although specialists must wait for the publication of the pottery to follow the arguments through.

The earliest remains are a few graves with Late Geometric pottery. The author believes that pottery was already made here in the late eighth century, and refers to the forthcoming publication of the vases where she will show that "Protocorinthian

Geometric" was locally produced—not, in itself, evidence, for Protocorinthian Geometric was made as late as 625 (Weinberg in *AJA*, XLV [1941], p. 44). Certainly there was activity in the first half of the seventh century, as much Protocorinthian ware and some slight architectural remains show. Most important is a socle of an early defense wall along the cliff, to be dated before 650; this, I should think, is the earliest dateable Greek fortification yet known. The second half of the seventh century was a prosperous period, with much building and a thriving ceramic industry. Notable is a long wall (which, from the plan, I took to be a terrace-wall) interpreted as the back of a rustic stoa with shops opening out on the street. A curious complex, quite certainly part of a potters' establishment, consists of a cemented pavement and a pit, probably for a pithos, the two connected by a double water channel; its purpose is not understood, but, given the levels, a potter might be able to explain it.

There was less building in the sixth century, except for some houses and wells, several "shrines" (to which we shall return) and another stoa-like building. Fifth century building remains are even scantier, with two important exceptions. The first is the western part of the City Wall of Corinth, which passes along the edge of the Quarter and was built, Mrs. Stillwell believes, in the late fifth century—perhaps on the eve of the Peloponnesian War. The evidence supporting this date seems reasonably good, and thus we have an important contribution to Corinthian history. (But we must discard from the evidence the form of the mason's mark +; it may not represent *chi* at all.) The sarcophagus containing a woman's skeleton, found under the Wall and beyond doubt interred before the Wall was built, provides the occasion for a learned excursus on foundation-sacrifices in antiquity; the author freely admits that this is merely speculation. The second building of note is the Terracotta Factory (built after 450, altered to conform with the Wall, expanded in the early fourth

century, and destroyed by an earthquake between 350 and 325). We cannot describe it here, but it is almost unique of its kind, and merits serious attention. The earthquake which finally destroyed it apparently marks the end of the whole Potters' Quarter; of Hellenistic and later times there is scarcely a trace.

Since this is the first precise archeological knowledge that we have of the furnishings for an ancient pottery-works, it is not surprising that there are some problems and apparent inconsistencies. There is no doubt that pottery and figurines were made here in great quantity; yet no trace of a kiln has been recognized in the excavated area, and aside from the Terracotta Factory few actual remains of potters' workshops and equipment are identified. In contrast, there are six "shrines" in a strip of land 200 m. long and 10 to 15 wide, with a seventh inside the Terracotta Factory itself. These are quite unlike any shrine known elsewhere in the Greek world; they are comparatively minute (the "Circular Shrine" is 1.40 m. in diameter), and the type of monument peculiar to them—an upright, stuccoed poros stele with an inset panel on one face and above it a shelf—is elsewhere unknown. These stelae were neither painted nor inscribed, and lack moldings, acroteria and every other attempt at decorative treatment. The author believes that they represent offering-tables, and cites a shelflike stone, placed by the excavators on two upright piers which it roughly fits. But this, even though it may belong on the piers, does not resemble a Greek offering-table; it appears to be cut for a utilitarian purpose, and so to my eye do the stelae. They must, I think, be somehow related to the craft of the potter or coroplast. In the "shrines" are found large quantities of pottery and figurines, but in a potters' quarter these need not be explained as votive objects. Of the so-called "Erosa Shrine" Mrs. Stillwell writes, "Tempting as it is to consider this tiny, two-roomed building a potters' shop, complete with its clay-pit, well, working-bench and little shrine [one

of the peculiar *stelae*] we must, nevertheless, admit that it is more likely to be a sanctuary." Why? Because (a) there is not enough broken pottery (but if this is where the potter throws and fashions his ware, no broken pottery need be found), and (b) a pyxis found in the vicinity bears the painted inscription TAMEPOMAME[ $\mu\tau$ ]? The pyxis, as the author readily admits, may not be connected with the building at all, and may not be a dedication. Tempting as it is to see in the building a shrine, then, we must admit that it is almost certainly a potters' workshop.

The section on architectural blocks and sculptures includes, aside from the peculiar stelae, three "altars" (the circular one seems rather to be a basis and with some of the others I am tempted to compare the potters' stools and stands that we see on vases — e. g., Beazley, *Potter and Painter*, Pl. 2, 1, and Pl. 5, 1 and 2). Besides these, a late archaic Doric capital (the only true architectural block) and a siren carved in poros are notable.

The terracotta molds are greater in number than any group yet published from an excavated site, and they thus constitute a major contribution to the study of figurines, always the most elusive class of Greek antiquities. It would have been better if the figurines could have been published together with the molds, but those which are from molds found here are at least listed. Two extraordinary examples show the importance of the molds. No. 28 is the mold for a protome of mid-fifth century style. Mrs. Stillwell has identified over seven casts from it: three from Corinth, several from the Pitsa Cave, one from Aetolia, one from Ithaca, and still another from Olynthus. In style, the mold is beyond any doubt of the fifth century, but stratigraphical evidence shows that it was in use for producing figurines in the period between 350 and 325 B.C. No. 13 is the mold for an archaic bust of a woman, and its uses are interesting; four known casts from it serve as pyxis-heads, another one for the head of a seated figure, yet another for a relief, one for the head of

a handmade horseman, and finally two more for the heads of a pair of handmade seated figurines. In these and many more cases, the author's keen eye has detected casts, often very fragmentary and in far-flung places, which come from dated Corinthian molds, and has taught us a great deal about their use and distribution.

In only one respect do I find her treatment of the molds disappointing, and since this may affect the treatment of the figurines as well, it is perhaps worth setting forth. This concerns the problem of the origin of molds, and especially the manufacture of molds from casts. That molds are made from casts from previous molds, and that shrinkage is the key to this line of descent, the author realizes, but I believe that more precise use of this principle could be made, perhaps with valuable chronological results. In the simplest case, if we have two casts, one from an early mold, and one from a later mold made from a cast of the first, only the measurements need vary; but this variation is proportionally constant and formulae exist for determining the rate of shrinkage with some precision. In more difficult cases, the cast from which the second mold was made may have been distorted or have acquired additions before it was fired; then we must watch sharply for the basic characteristics of the original. The essentials which we must have to apply this principle are these: two measurements (one vertical, one horizontal) made on the cast itself, between parts of the figure not likely to be changed; and, when dealing with ancient molds, fired clay casts from them (plaster casts expand instead of shrinking and thus give neither the measurement nor the precise appearance of clay casts). Given such measurements, it would be interesting to see whether for each of the following groups of molds from the Pottery Quarter a single patris could not be found: 30 and 31; 32-34; 36, 37 and 39; 43-48; 53-55; 62-63. For the whole subject see Jastrow, "Abformung und Typenwandel in der antiken Tonplastik" (*Opuscula Archaeologica*, II [1941], 1 ff.).

The great value of this book and the excavation it describes lies partly in the fact that it is a Pottery Quarter, and even more that it is at Corinth. We have never before had an excavation report on a pottery-works in any way comparable to this, and when publication is completed many of the questions about the technique of the ancient potter should be answered. And the fact that this is the very place where some of the most famous pottery and plastic art of antiquity originated greatly increases its worth. It is thus a site of prime importance to both the archeologist and the historian, and it is worth noting, at a time when money for excavations is scarce, that to clear this site and regain a vast amount of material required relatively small expense. The entire excavation took only nine months, with an average of ten workmen. Here is what was recovered: 2,700 inventoried vases plus 3,000-4,000 miniature vases; 2,300 inventoried figurines; 103 coins, and a large collection of lamps, loomweights, etc., besides the molds and metal objects (these last of slighter importance) presented in this first volume. Those who chose this site for excavation must be highly praised, and so must Mrs. Stillwell for the patience and skill she has shown in conducting a difficult and intricate excavation. Many will look forward to further volumes with great expectation.

J. H. YOUNG

*The Johns Hopkins University*

Ἡ Σύγκλητος εἰς τὸ Βυζαντινὸν κράτος. By A.A. CHRISTOPHILOPOULOU. Athens, 1949.

"The Senate or Synkletos of New Rome . . .," writes Bury, "was a very different body from the old *Senatus Romanus*. It was a small council consisting of persons who belonged to it by virtue of administrative offices to which they were appointed by the state . . . There were various political matters which the emperor was bound by custom to lay before it. We have not the material for enumerating what those matters were . . ."

Mrs. Christophilopoulou, mindful perhaps of Bury's statement that "we have not the material for enumerating what" the matters which the emperor lay before the senate were, has produced a book which should prove definitive. She has brought together the various references relating to the Byzantine senate which she has been able to find in all the sources; official and unofficial documents, seals, inscriptions, histories and chronicles, and other literary forms. Other studies concerning the Byzantine senate may appear in the future, but it is extremely doubtful if they will make any appreciable additions to the material brought together by Mrs. Christophilopoulou.

The book consists of an Introduction and five chapters. The Introduction, as was to be expected, deals with generalities concerning the nature and function of the Byzantine senate, notices the principal works hitherto published both on the Roman and Byzantine senate, and gives an outline of the nature of the sources on which the rest of the work is based. The emphasis is put on the period after the reign of Justinian, but the entire length of the history of the empire is covered.

Each of the five chapters deals with some aspect of the Byzantine senate. In the first chapter there is a systematic analysis of the sources in an effort to determine the terms used in the Greek sources to render the Roman *senatus*. For the earlier Roman period the work had been done by D. Magie, but this is the first attempt made to carry it through to the end of the Byzantine empire. The matter is of considerable importance, for, unless the terminology is determined, it is not possible to determine the passages in the sources which refer to the senate. Σύγκλητος, σύγκλητος βουλὴ, ἱερὰ σύγκλητος, γερούσια, ἐκκλησία, συνέδριον are the terms used. The second chapter is devoted to the problem of the composition of the senate, and an attempt is made to determine what dignities and administrative positions entitled one to belong to the senatorial order. Here again all the passages that relate to

the subject are brought together. For the period between Justinian and Leo VI the author relies heavily upon the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos, but, since for the later period there is no such document, she attempts to solve the problem by examining all the sources and drawing a list of the senators which they mention together with their dignities. A remarkable piece of work. The functioning of the senate is the subject of the third chapter, while in the fourth we find a discussion concerning its duties. The Byzantine senate was, of course, a purely consultative body and the emperor was not obligated to call on it for advice. But the fact is that he did so, especially when important political or ecclesiastical decisions were pending. The senate also acted as a judicial body in certain cases. All these are carefully examined by Mrs. Christophilopoulou and all the references relating to them are brought together. The last chapter examines the social position of the senators, their place in the administration, their privileges and obligations, and their position in law. Not the least valuable part of the book are its indices. There are two: one of the sources, the other of subject matter.

The work of Mrs. Christophilopoulou should prove of great value to those students of Byzantium who seek to elucidate its political institutions. It makes a fundamental contribution. It was first printed in the *Bulletin of the Archives of the History of Greek Law* (Ἐπετηρίς τοῦ ἀρχείου τῆς ἱστορίας τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Δικαίου [1949]). It appeared in book form as an offprint.

PETER CHARANIS

Rutgers University

*Die Kultur der Antike.* By ERNST HOWALD. ("Erasmus-Bibliothek," ed. WALTER RÜEGG.) 2d ed. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1948. Pp. 273.

This work first appeared in 1935 as a volume in the "Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte" edited by Heinz Kindermann (Potsdam: Akad. Verlagsgesellschaft Ath-

enaion, 1935). Except for the omission of the many illustrations which appeared in the first issue, and a change in format, this second edition is practically, word for word, the same as the first.

Ordinarily, under such circumstances, it would be enough to note the reissue, and to refer the reader to reviews of the earlier work. The present reviewer, however, has been unable to find any notice of it in the more prominent English and American professional journals; it seems to have been almost equally neglected on the Continent. In Germany, however, by way of exception, it provoked a notable response on the part of Walter Otto under the title *Antike Kulturgeschichte: Betrachtungen zu Ernst Howalds "Kultur der Antike,"* ("Sitzungsberichte d. bayer. Akad. d. Wissenschaften; phil.-hist. Abteilung; Jahrgang 1940, Heft 6) Munich, Verlag d. bayer. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, 1940, pp. 78.

In his second edition, Howald refers to this work as "Die ausführliche ausgesprochen feindselige Besprechung Walter Ottos" (p. 257). Since, however, he fails to give heed to Otto's criticism, or even to discuss it, it may be presumed that he rejects it as completely as Otto rejects his book.

Howald's thesis may be summarized under the following headings:

1. Cultural history is the history of art and literature. "Es steht darum die Kulturgeschichte der Kunst- oder Literaturgeschichte näher als der gewöhnlichen Geschichte. Ja, es müssen und dürfen die Werke der Kunst als wichtigste Zeugnisse für den Kulturwillen einer Epoche genommen werden, da sich in ihnen immer, in Religion, Staat, Politik nur ausnahmsweise, die vorhandenen Kräfte manifestieren, und zwar hemmungslos" (pp. 7-8).

2. The European "Rhythmusform" is humanism, and humanism is Hellenism. "Europa ist am europäischsten, wenn es sich seiner Hellenogenität so bewußt ist, daß es hellenozentrisch wird" (p. 9). Greek humanism is fundamentally the culture of Athens in the age of Pericles. "Es braucht keine weiteren Worte zum Beweis dessen,

daß Perikles hier die Grundzüge der politisch-sozialen Weltanschauung wiedergibt, die wir die liberale nennen" (pp. 62-63).

3. Roman humanism derived from the Greek, and manifested itself in two forms; that of "social humanism," which began with the third century B.C. and ended with the death of the younger Scipio; and that of "political humanism," which followed and conflicted with the former. The highest development of Roman humanism occurred under Augustus; thereafter it gradually declined until it disappeared at the close of the second century after Christ.

If this work is taken for what it is, "weniger ein Werk über die antike Kultur, ... als ein umfangreicher, geistreicher Essay über sie ..." (Otto, p. 9), it is not without merit, and the reflections which it provokes not without relation to our times.

In order to make history fit his bed, however, Howald has performed a Procrustean operation upon antiquity, and the result is not the past that was but the past as Howald would it were. Art and literature are not the only manifestations of culture (e.g., there is religion, which Howald treats most inadequately). The Periclean age is not the whole of Athenian culture, and Athenian culture is only a part of Greek culture. Again, to say that Europe is most European when it is most Greek is to settle a question by definition. Others might say (and some have said) that European culture is most European when it is most German, or when it is most Christian.

With the same ease with which he dismisses epochs and movements which lie outside his arbitrary definitions, Howald disposes of men and their works. Plato, whom Jaeger places at the center of Greek cultural history, is the man who "*hat den Griechen das Irrationale aufgelockert*" (italics Howald's) (p. 94). Herodotus' history is described "als ein grandioses Wachsfigurenkabinett, ausgewählt nicht nach geschichtlichen Prinzipien, sondern von der hemmungslosen Neugier nach Kuriositäten der Seele und des Schicksals" (p. 29). Thucydides' history is "äußerlich und in-



nerlich ein Torso" (p. 79). The elder Cato is "der eindrucksvollste Exponent der alten Ordnung;..." (p. 156). The *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius are a "Beamtenbrevier" (p. 222). Aristotle is mentioned only incidentally. But perhaps the most exaggerated and infelicitous of Howald's statements is his characterization of the Roman Empire. "Die Regierung des römischen Imperiums ist eine der schlechtesten und trostlosesten, die die Weltgeschichte je gesehen hat;..." (p. 248). Even those philhellenes among us who still call the Romans barbarians would hardly go this far.

W. F. McDONALD

The Ohio State University

*Anthologia lyrica Graeca*, Fasc. 1: *Poetae Elegiaci*. Edited by ERNESTUS DIEHL †. 3d ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1949. Pp. ii + 144. \$2.40.

*Anthologia lyrica Graeca*, Fasc. 2: *Theognis; Ps.-Pythagoras; Ps.-Phocylides; Chares; Anonymi aulodia*. Edited by ERNESTUS DIEHL †. 3d ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1950. Pp. viii + 116. \$1.97.

In these days when so many texts are difficult to come by, even a reprint of Diehl's second edition would have been welcome. These first two fascicules of the third edition, planned by Diehl and carried to completion after his death in 1947 by Rudolf Beutler, are doubly welcome, and it is to be hoped that other parts of the work will soon follow.

The general plan remains the same and there is relatively little change in the Greek text. There are a few additions, mostly of minor importance: in the first section, Frag. 12 A of Mimnermus, Frag. 11 of Ion of Chios, and among the *adespota* Frags. 6a, 12a and 20; in the second, the fragments of Chares (now restored to his rightful place as a gnomic poet), and the anonymous set of quatrains in "teliambic" or miuric meter (*P Oxy.*, 1795). Of these Frag. ades. 20 is the most interesting, for it contains some forty lines, tantalizingly incomplete, which may be by one of the

early Ionian elegists, perhaps Callinus or Mimnermus; lines d 10-11 seem to contain the earliest known reference to Hecate *τρεῖς ἑκατος*. A number of the ancient *testimonia* are, helpfully, given in more complete form than before. In addition Sophocles Frag. 4 (the paean to Asclepius) now appears, with a few modifications, in the text as established by J. H. Oliver (*Hesp.*, V [1936], 91-122). The most significant improvement, however, is Ibscher's reconstruction of Tyrtaeus Frag. 1, which reduces the 78 lines to 63 by a better placing of the papyrus fragments, and makes obsolete the reconstructions of Gercke, Sitzler, and de Falco printed in the second edition. It is evidently on the basis of a certain moralistic tone that the *Anonymi aulodia* has been classed as gnomic poetry, though as convivial verse it might equally well have been reserved for inclusion with the other *scolia*. In any case it is unfortunate that *P Oxy.*, 15, which is part of a similar or perhaps even of the same composition, as well as the two lesser fragments of *P Oxy.*, 1795 should have been omitted altogether from the collection.

For American scholars perhaps the most valuable feature will be the additional bibliographical material, particularly for those works published in continental Europe during the war. It is not surprising, on the other hand, that with rare exceptions British and American work of that period is not cited, and the reader must add for himself such references as H. T. Wade-Gery, *CQ*, XXXVIII (1944), 1-9 on Tyrtaeus Frag. 3, R. Lattimore, *AJP*, LXVIII (1947), 161-79 on Solon Frag. 1, C. M. Bowra, *CQ*, XXXV (1941), 119-26 on Xenophanes Frag. 3, and, on the word *ὀργειῶνας* in Antimachus Frag. 2, W. S. Ferguson, *HThR*, XXXVII (1944), 131-32.

The usual Teubner standards of accuracy seem to have been maintained, and the print, though perhaps less pleasing than that previously used, is clear despite the inferior quality of the paper.

FRANCIS R. WALTON

University of Chicago

*Euripides: Helena*. Edited, with Commentary and General Remarks, by A. Y. CAMPBELL. Liverpool: The University Press of Liverpool, 1950. Pp. xviii + 172. 12s.6d.

In an age when most scholars have shown a deep reluctance to resort to wholesale emendation of the texts and an increasing scepticism as to the value or necessity of such a procedure, Professor Campbell is a brilliant exception, who unabashedly adheres to that unfashionable but time-honored practice. Those who are familiar with his earlier publications will know what to expect from this edition of the *Helena*. The unwary student, however, should not be misled by the subtitle of the work: the General Remarks are limited to a brief and discursive concluding essay (pp. 157-69), of which nearly a third concerns not the *Helena* but the *Bacchae*; of Commentary in the usual sense there is very little. This is not, nor is it intended to be, a companion volume to the new Oxford editions of the separate plays of Euripides. Nor will it, for most purposes, replace Pearson.

Rather, as the author's Preface makes clear, his primary interest, to the exclusion of nearly all else, is the reconstruction of the text, and it is to the textual problems and especially to a defense of his own conjectural readings that the hundred pages of notes are almost entirely devoted. As printed here, the text of the play differs markedly from that of the standard editions. A number of emendations proposed in the past have here found acceptance for the first time, and those of the editor himself number more than 125. These range from the correction of minor points to the virtual rewriting of whole passages, e.g., lines 1319-37. Campbell's self-assurance knows few bounds. No crux has been left unresolved, and all lacunae have been filled. The entire play has, as it were, been subjected to a unitary process of emendation, and it is this fact alone that may, perhaps, justify in some degree the publication of the author's conjectures in the guise of a commentary to the full text. Even so,

the discussion is not complete, and more than once the reader is referred to articles already published or yet to appear.

Campbell's erudition and ingenuity are equally great. He is, moreover, clearly right in insisting that exact metrical correspondence in the lyrics is a most important guide to the proper reading, though, rather surprisingly, he does not bother to provide a metrical analysis of the play. As to the validity of the individual conjectures future editors will have to decide. To the reviewer many seemed plausible, some completely convincing, a few both unnecessary and detrimental. For the most part they result in greater clarity and smoothness, and in a stricter logic. Yet it is precisely where this result is most evident, in certain lyrical passages, that the propriety of the undertaking seems most questionable. Where the corruption is as deep-seated as Campbell claims, is not a frank recognition of the disease wiser at times than a bland assumption that the poet's work has been restored to its original purity? Poetry, moreover, is not always at home with strict logic, and the horrid example of Bentley's edition of Milton should never be forgotten. Yet it is salutary that a critical attitude towards the tradition of the ancient texts should be maintained, and for this service, well and vigorously performed, Professor Campbell deserves our thanks.

FRANCIS R. WALTON

*University of Chicago*

*Euripides: Selected Plays, with Introduction, Metrical Synopsis and Commentary, Part I: The Alkestis*. By D. F. W. VAN LENNEP. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1949. Pp. viii + 156. 6.50 guilders.

Van Lennep's doctoral dissertation, *Euripides ποιητής σοφός* (1935), which might well have interested a fairly wide audience was, unfortunately, published in Dutch, and accordingly received no critical notice in either England or America. Van Lennep has now undertaken to edit a

selection (not further defined) of the plays of Euripides, of which this is the first. It is a useful and welcome volume, but it is in no sense a definitive edition, nor is it strikingly original. Just why it should appear in English rather than Dutch is not made clear, but if we can discern here any reaction to the exaggerated nationalism that produced scholarly books in so many of the lesser tongues of Europe, *omen accipiamus!*

The commentary and introduction are, in their own way, excellent. The editor is primarily concerned with the literary and dramatic values, and problems, of the play, and subsidiary questions, whether of linguistics, religion, *Realien*, or metric, are given only occasional notice. Clearly it is not van Lennep's intention to rival the series of Oxford editions of Euripides now in progress. Perhaps the most serious lack is a critical *apparatus*. Textual matters are for the most part ignored, except where the text printed deviates from that of Murray. Again, though nine pages are given to the metrical synopsis, no attempt is made to analyze or clarify the basic rhythm of each choral passage; here he might well have profited from the example of Dodd's *Bacchae*. As for short comings of another sort, there are at least ten typographical errors in the Greek text, several of them serious enough to cause some confusion; more charitably, one might wish that a native "informant" had touched up the English — and had read proof on it as well.

Yet when all this has been said, the fact remains that van Lennep has kept in mind the primary function of an editor, to make clear the meaning of the text. Unlike some of his predecessors he has not reduced his text to a *corpus vile* for the grammarians nor has he used it as a base for dubious ventures into the realm of Greek religion. It is for its interest as literature that he presents the play, and in his approach to the problems posed by the Alcestis he exhibits sensitivity, common sense, and a sense of humor. He seems to be unaware of the work of Kitto and Grube (perhaps a

measure of the persistence of our own Iron Curtains), but his interpretation is ably argued, plausible, and well worth consideration. Van Lennep's edition is something more than a mere school text, and if later volumes prove equally good, the series may well find an accepted place not only in our libraries but in our classrooms.

FRANCIS R. WALTON

University of Chicago

*Les Adjectifs latins en -ōsus et en -ulentus.*

By A. ERNOUT. ("Collection linguistique: La Société de Linguistique de Paris," Vol. LIV.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1949. Pp. 121.

"It is strange" wrote Buck (*Comparative Grammar*, p. 334) of the derivation of Latin *-ōsus* from *-o-uent-to-* "that the spelling with *-n-* is attested only for *formonsus*" (both inscriptions and older manuscripts have this), which is also written *formossus*, like *Verrucossus*, *Imperiossus* (Brambach, p. 268). Some of the ancient *testimonia* as to *formonsus* are condemnatory; they condemn, in the same breath, *-onsus* in *aquosus*, *frondosus*, *gloriosus*, *harenosus*, *herbosus* (Brambach, *ibid.*), from which it must be concluded that someone had used the wrong spellings. Why? Simply because *-ns-* is a common mark of length in late orthography? Or (as Buck's comment would seem to suggest) because, in these adjectives, the *-n-* actually was etymological? One almost certain example that everyone seems to have overlooked is *maculonsas* at Juv. 7.40 (Housman; Bywater *ap.* Duff; Ribbeck; cf. *TLL*, s.v.); for the *maculonis* of P and *maculonis* and *maculonius* of other MSS, together with the *maculosas* of the scholiast's copy, make the reading certain. Apart from this, there is no reason that I can see for preferring the analysis *-o-uent-to-* to *-od-to-*, except the desire to see *μορφῆς* identical with *formosus* morphologically as well as semantically.

It is perhaps a laborious, but hardly an erudite, affair now-a-days to assemble a

list of all the adjectives in Latin in *-osus* (Ernout, pp. 13-77, grouped alphabetically by derivation from first and fifth, second, third, and fourth declension nouns, or adjectives, or of irregular derivation); and in *-ulentus* (pp. 89-98, in simple alphabetical order), a much smaller number; to run down the places in which they occur and to give brief quotations showing their usage, or to write a few comments on the usage and force of each; and to produce also Greek adjectives in *-εις* (*-εινός*) or *-ώδης* to set beside them, wherever pertinent. The "reverse" indexes of Gradenwitz and of Buck and Petersen (with Kretschmer and Locker, also 1944, but not used by Ernout) make the listing itself mere child's play, the work being done already. And *TLL* is now far enough advanced to make the need of special lexicons and glossaries, still more the reading of the text, less urgent than it would have been even half a century ago. Souter's *Glossary of Later Latin* no doubt appeared too late (1949) to be used in addition to the works named on page 106. For *memorosa*, page 102, read *memorosa*, and for *nemorosus* 101 (p. 115) read 102.

Ernout's conclusion is that the adjectives in *-osus* and *-ulentus* are derivatives "au moyen d'un suffixe et non des composés." But this does not take us very far, except by way of denial. For, after all, the previous question remains: what Latin suffixes, if any, arose from composition? Composition is not excluded because it is not so obvious in Latin (or in English) as it is in Greek. Is *-ός*, or *-stis*, or *-quos* due to composition or not? This is the real question that needs to be answered. If *-ulentus* really started from *olens* (admitted as possible by most authorities), then contexts such as Plaut. *Cist.* 382 (*mustulentus aestus nares attigit*) and words such as *ancunulentus* (cf. *menstruosus*), *crapulentus*, *faeculentus*, *foetulentus* (cf. *foetorosus*, *foetosus*, *foedusus*), *lotiolentus*, *merulentus*, *temulentus*, *uinulentus*; or, again, if *-osus*, as Wackernagel thought, stands for *-od-to-* words such as *illuuiosus*, *nauseosus*, *buxosus* ([*lignum*]) "quod et

odoratissimum" Pl. *HN* 12. 119), *citrosus*, *fumosus*, *hircosus* (Plaut. *Merc.* 574-75 "anima foetida, senex hircosus"; *putidus* in the glossaries goes with *hircosus*, *CGL*, VI, 146, s.v. "blennones"; *hircosus*: *sudore fetidus*, *ibid.*, 522), *florosus* (cf. *florulentus*), *uirosus*, *frondosus* (*-uosus*), *frondositas*, *nidorosus*, *stercorosus*, *sudosus*, *suffraginosus* (?), *tabidosus*, *uinositus* ("bouquet"), not to go outside Ernout's pages, all these are telling. The suffix *-osus*, again as Ernout points out, has been unusually productive through all its long history; it is so still in French, and in English; and whatever its precise origin and original meaning, they have been obscured by its wide extension. The evidence, until it is more finely sifted, may be read in more than one way.

As for *Bonosus* (p. 34), its relation to the name, common on terra sigillata, *Bonoxus* and the Aquitanian *Bonexsi*, *Bonixsus*, *Bonnexsi(s)*, *Bonxus* (Iberian? cf. *DAG*, 87) needs to be clarified; and granted that *Bell(i)us*, *Bellosa* (also p. 34), *Bellicus* are frequent in Gaul, are they really "d'origine celtique"? Why?

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*Les Noms grecs en -της, -τις et principalement en -ιτης, -ιτις: Étude philologique et linguistique.* By G. REDARD. ("Études et commentaires," no. V.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1949. Pp. x + 316.

In English *fowler* we have *-er* (OE *-ere*, OHG *-āri*, Gothic *-āreis*) suffixed to the noun *fowl*, like *-τᾱ-* in Greek *πολίτᾱς*, *πολίτης* beside *πόλις*, or *τεχνίτης* beside *τέχνη*. The suffix has become productive in nouns of agency (*voter*, *fielder*, *jeweler*, *breeder*, *bleeder*, *slaver*, *defaulter*, *piker*, *filter*, *turner* and many others, from both nouns and verbs), especially in compounds: *bootlegger*, *highjacker*, *gate-crasher*, *gogetter*, *globe-trotter*, *hitch-hiker*, *sharecropper*, *share-pusher*. It appears in recent slang (*wowser*, *bedder*), in names of games (slang *rugger*, *soccer*), plants (*climber*, *sucker*), of animals

(setter, pointer, boxer, springer, terrier), and in proper names (*Londoner, Britisher, Hollander, New Yorker, New Zealander, Bostoner, Westerner, Down Easter, North Easter, Southerner, Southdowner* [Engl.], *Sundowner* [Australia as well as in U.S. Navy], *Prestoner, Birkenheader*, some of which have become personal, as *Dutcher*), and some names of religious groups (*Quaker, Shaker, Holyroller*). Suppose now, with Bloomfield, that you analyze *spider, hammer, rudder* into "root" and suffix *-er* (as a "descriptive technique"), then imagine that you see *-er* as a suffix in names of metals or stones (*silver, copper, pewter, boulder*), of eatables (*cruller*), in medical terms (*leper, fever, cancer, liver, fiber, ulcer, catalyzer*) or of drinks (*licker, beer*!), *Cusenier, de Kuyper, Grand Marnier* as well as in other categories (*beaver; Vancouver*), and you will have some notion of the enormous growth in Greek (though you will not need to imagine imaginary "roots" and "suffixes"), especially in post-classical Greek, that the use of *-(υ)της*, and its feminine *-(υ)τις* underwent, though you might not have suspected it without Redard's careful and laborious collection of the actual words from all conceivable sources.

The main facts were known (Buck, pp. 336-37), and it cannot be said that theory will be changed by this Neuchâtel thesis, inspired by Niedermann. But merely to turn the pages is continually to be astonished by the author's insight into the linguistic problem and his resourcefulness of explanation, as well as edified by coming upon terms which no doubt are familiar enough to one specialist or another, but can hardly all have come within the ken of one man's reading. Here are some interesting examples: p. 37 (*τεχνίτης*-type), *σταβλίτης* "post rider, stable boy" (Lat. *stabularius*) from Schol. Ar. and Pap., cpd. *ἀρχισταβλίτης* Pap.; *ἀμαλίτης* "courier" also Pap., apparently from the Arabic *hammāl* "porter"; p. 47, *μνηματίτης* "one who has charge of the sepulcher of the saints" Ἀνάργυροι at Alexandria" Sophronius, beside *μεμορίτης* (p. 25) from

Lat. *memoria*, "monk who lives in (or guards) a tomb" (Chal.); names of minerals, precious stones and the like (cf. modern *anthracite, pyrite, greenockite*), *inter alia*; p. 52, *ἀκτίτης* (:Ἀκτή) Soph. Frag., insec.; p. 53, mod. Gr. *γρανίτης* "granite" (borrowed from French); p. 54, *μαγνίτης* (:Μάγνης) in technical writers and the glossaries; p. 89 (among the "produits de boulangerie"), *διपुरίτης* "biscuit" Hippocrates, also mod. Gr.; p. 97 (wines), *\*κανθαρίτης* (from Κανθάριος ἄκρα Samos) only in Pliny (*cantharites*), but *καμπανίτης* mod. Gr. "champagne"; p. 103 (medical terms), mod. Gr. *σκοληροειδίτις* "appendicitis," exactly like ancient words in *-ίτις* (e.g., *νεφρίτις*); p. 105, mod. Gr. *φρονιμίτης* and *σωφρονίτης* "wisdom tooth"; p. 215 (religious sects): Ἀδαμίται "Adamists" (nudists, the North African sect of the second and third centuries, forerunners of the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit), Theod. *Epiph. ad Isid.*; p. 221, *Κρεατίται* ("carne numquam uescebantur," vegetarians) no ref. Redard appears not to know (pp. 118, 221) where he could have found already collected the ancient local and divine names in *-itēs, -itis*, of Sicily and Italy, and (now) of Gaul. His indexes fill pp. 265-314.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*Griechische Plastik, Vol. I: Die großen Bildhauer des archaischen Athen.* By KARL SCHEFOLD. Basel: Verlag Birkhäuser, 1949. Pp. 76 + 90 pls. Swiss fr. 8.50.

This is a small book, measuring less than 7 by 4½ inches over all, but it contains a great deal. A few of the ninety plates show more than one sculpture, and a number of sculptures have more than one illustration, sometimes on different plates. Somewhat less than half of the material comes from the Acropolis, and most of the rest has been well known, but there are several objects from the excavations of the Agora and the Kerameikos, and several that have appeared without publicly known back-



ground in one museum or another. The plates are generally of satisfactory quality; a singular exception is the "Marathon Warrior," which is evidently reproduced from a half-tone. In addition to the plates, there are nine drawings in the text, which show reconstructed compositions. With a dozen or so exceptions, all the objects illustrated are certainly Attic; and they constitute a well selected series, extending from the eighth century to 500 B.C., which will be adequate except for specialized study. It is rather a pity that the head of the most charming of the Acropolis ladies could not be better shown. She is mentioned as the "Girl with the Almond Eyes," and that name is doubtless better than "No. 674"; but in some circles she is known as "Arlanoe," which is surely still more appropriate to her θεσπεσίη χάρις.

The text is divided into three main parts: Ursprung, Formgeschichte, Die Meister. As is indicated in the title of the book, some emphasis is placed on individual sculptors. Two, Endoios and Antenor, are known by name; and the head and hand from the Dipylon, the Moschophoros, the Rampin horseman, the Rayet head in Copenhagen, and the pedimental group from Eretria serve as centers for little groups of attributions. Most of the attributions have already appeared in Payne or in Schrader-Langlotz-Schuchhardt; the latter work is not at hand, and it is not clear in every case whether the suggestion is new or not. No one who takes this kind of study seriously will try to appraise attribution of sculpture in the round without examination of the originals (or of casts, which do not exist). It may be observed, on the one hand, that among the numerous archaic dedications on the Acropolis some sculptors ought to be represented by more than one work, and that the concentration of the sculptures in the Acropolis Museum favors comparative study; and on the other hand, that some of the suggestions contained in the book are remarkably bold. We have a notable statue probably by Endoios, but no head, and it is risky to supply the deficiency by

bestowing on him the Sabouroff head (p. 47). It can hardly be agreed that Tektaios and Angelion were obviously "maßgebend" for any generation (p. 45); or that, if none of the pedimental figures at Delphi is Antenor's work, there is any way to recognize him as the sculptor in charge (p. 53). In writing of the originality and influence of Antenor's Harmodios, the author might have said something of the figure in the restoration that he presents of the pedimental group of the old temple of Athena, which, if it existed, was an anticipation of the Harmodios.

Even the third part of the text is by no means limited to consideration of individual artists, but attention is directed to the sculptures as personal creations, not merely as products of one or another decade, and that is highly desirable. An "Anhang" comprises a section on chronology, in which the conclusions of K. Kübler (*Arch. Anz.*, LVIII [1943], 417 ff.) are examined, and notes to the text, the illustrations in the text, and the plates. These notes are chiefly bibliographical, and the references omit little of value up to 1945, when the book was written; a "Nachtrag" adds a few later ones. The book is elementary in the sense that no prior acquaintance with the subject is assumed, but it is a work of alert and independent scholarship, addressed to readers who desire the best information on the subject and are prepared to devote some attention to it.

According to a statement on the jacket, it is planned to publish all important Greek sculptures in volumes of the same series. It is not stated how many volumes are contemplated, perhaps eight or ten? The undertaking will be well worth while. It would be desirable for many readers, and perhaps profitable for the publishers, if the volumes could be provided with English text.

F. P. JOHNSON

*University of Chicago*

*P. Cornelii Taciti Germania*. Edited by ERICH KOESTERMANN. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1949. Pp. 32. \$0.35.

The late Professor Rodney P. Robinson, the night before his death, was working on a review of this book. The notes which he left show that he was making a detailed study of Koestermann's *Germania* in the light of his own edition of the same work.<sup>1</sup> Since Koestermann made slight use of the results of Robinson's research, and since he characterized three manuscripts which Robinson considered valuable, as *nullius momenti*,<sup>2</sup> it is obvious that the review which Robinson was preparing to write would not have been a favorable one. In spite of Koestermann's disdain for the Vienna, Munich, and Hummel manuscripts, Robinson's notes indicate that in a study of seventy pivotal readings Koestermann has adopted the reading supported by a combination of these three codices in sixty percent of the cases where they agree against the other manuscripts.

It is to be noted that while Robinson for his edition collated at first hand or from photographs all the manuscripts which he used, Koestermann makes use of collations made as long ago as 1898 and 1907. In view of the progress that has been made in paleographical studies in the last half century, the practice of bringing out new editions based upon collations which are out of date and often inaccurate is deplorable. A comparison of this seventh Teubner edition with the preceding one shows that, in Robinson's opinion, unfortunate changes, based upon insufficient manuscript evidence or upon pure emendation, were made in the following cases:<sup>3</sup> 5.3 *argentumque*; 13.2 *ceterum*; 34.2 *Drusi*; 39.3 *pagi iis habitantur*; 45.6 *Sithonum*.

Although it has been noted that Koestermann paid scant attention to Robinson's painstaking analysis of the manu-

scripts of the *Germania*,<sup>4</sup> there are indications that he sometimes used the American edition in a way that misrepresented the editor. Such instances, as noted by Robinson, are: 6.3 *primum quod praeferit Robinson* (with no reference to manuscript authority); 29.2 *quod [hi] ipso Riese et Robinson* (where Robinson merely cites Riese's emendation in the *apparatus*); 31.2 *lacunam suspicatur Robinson* (with no mention of the reading in W, upon which this hypothesis is based); 45.2 *hominumque*, an emendation adopted by Robinson from Urlichs, is credited to Urlichs and Anderson.

This is obviously not the review that Professor Robinson would have written had he been spared to complete the task which he had started in his thorough, scholarly fashion. But it has seemed preferable to present in this curtailed form the observations which he had made (so far as I have been able to interpret them), rather than to expand them in a way that he might not have approved.

DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN

Wellesley College

*Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*. Post FR. BLASS et GUIL. SUESS sextum edidit BRUNO SNELL. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1949. Pp. 54 + 142. \$4.75.

This new edition of Snell's *Bacchylides* includes very few additions to the corpus. The two new fragments of the London papyrus recognized by Medea Norsa<sup>1</sup> have been fitted into their places in 4 and 12, and there have been added from an unpublished *Oxyrhynchus* papyrus a few broken lines of one epinician and the pleasant opening of another (14 A and B). *P. Berol.*, 16. 140, printed by Bowra as possibly Pindar (Frag. 341 in his edition),

1. *The Germania of Tacitus* (Amer. Phil. Assoc. [Middletown, Conn., 1935]).

2. P. 5.

3. All references to the *Germania* are to chapter and section in the Teubner edition.

4. C. W. Mendell (CW, XLIV [1949], 8) refers to "the cavalier sweeping aside of Robinson's work in Koestermann's prefatory note to the *Germania*."

1. *Annali della R. Sc. Norm. Sup. di Pisa*, 1941, pp. 155-63. Cf. B. Snell, *Hermes*, LXXVI (1941), 208-19.

reappears here as probably Bacchylides, which will surprise no one.<sup>2</sup>

But the sixth edition is not simply a reprint of the fifth with these additions. The text incorporates the results of the restudy of A and P already in part reported on,<sup>3</sup> and of still later work on P, with the result that there is hardly a page of the new edition which does not differ in some degree from its predecessor. The reader is given the very last and fullest information on recoverable readings. Where the difference is as slight as the substitution of δ for λ in a badly broken passage the advantage may lie only in the heading-off of unprofitable conjectures, but in some cases, e.g., Frag. 20 A. 7-13 (Frag. 20 A 1-6 in the former edition), the changes provide a real clarification of the text. In others, we learn that we have been too sanguine. Cf. 13.97, where the fifth edition read ἀ τὸ [ι ππευτ] ἀν ἐτι [κτε Πηλέα. Closer inspection of the papyrus has weakened the case for Headlam's supplement, and in the new edition we find ἀ τὸ [...]. [ι.].ων ἐτι [κτε Πηλέα.

There are few changes in conjectural readings. The obelized passages of the earlier edition are still obelized. This reviewer, who does not pretend to have made a complete collation of the two editions, has noticed few changes in supplements, save where made possible or necessitated by new findings in the papyrus. (E.g., Frag. 20C. 11, where ἀ γ[δ] [ι χ] ἀριζόμενος replaces ... ρ[.] [ι.]. ρτομενος of the earlier edition. Cf. also 10.9, 11; 13.167.) But we can be sure other questions have been treated as open: e.g., at 3.44 Blass' ροινίσσεται has yielded to Kenyon's ἐρεῖθεται, the scales apparently having been turned by Hesychius' curious gloss ἐρεῖθεται πῖμπλαται which here makes its first appearance in the *testimonia*.

The introductory material is largely unchanged save where the addition of new material to the text has called for supplementation or alteration of the commentary.

Some further examples have been provided in the dialectical and metrical sections. The bibliography has been brought up to date, and the new work taken account of, where necessary, in introduction or *apparatus*. In short the 1949 edition now replaces that of 1934 as the indispensable Bacchylides.

The format is agreeable, though the type used is not as handsome, nor in the *apparatus* as easily legible, as in the pre-war Teubner. P. 37\*, line 12, read 14 for 16; p. 51\*, col. 1, *ad. fin.*, read *ad* 4, 6-12 for *ad* 5, 6-12; p. 52\*, col. 2, line 1, read Smyth for Smith (cf. D. M. Robinson, *CP*, XXXI [1936], 269).

ELIZABETH WYCKOFF

Mount Holyoke College

*Appendix Sallustiana*, Fasc. 1: *C. Sallusti Crispi epistulae ad Caesarem senem de re publica*. Edited by ALPHONSE KURFESS. 3d ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1950. Pp. viii + 28. \$0.60.

*Appendix Sallustiana*, Fasc. 2: [*Sallusti*] *in Ciceronem et invicem invectivae*. Edited by ALPHONSE KURFESS. 2d ed. rev. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1950. Pp. vi + 25. \$0.57.

The third edition of the *Epistulae ad Caesarem* differs little from the second (1930) in its text, but it is vastly improved in the accuracy of the references to parallel passages and in the indexes. More than a hundred errors have been corrected, and relatively few new mistakes have crept in. There are three misprints in the text: at page 6, line 10, for *populus* read *populos*; at 18, 5, for *amplissimus* read *amplissimis*; at 18, 24, for *paucissimus* read *paucissimis*. The few misprints that I noticed in the critical notes and indexes may easily be corrected from the context.

The *Praefatio* has been enlarged by the addition of a number of bibliographical items which, in the editor's opinion, have definitely proved that the letters are genuine. The new readings admitted into the text are also recorded in the *Praefatio*

2. Cf. B. Snell, *Hermes*, LXXV (1940), 182-83.

3. B. Snell, *Hermes*, LXXI (1936), 124-26.

(p. vii). The citations of parallels have been expanded by reference to four additional passages in Plato and one in Cicero. There are half a dozen new entries in the critical notes, and references to *RE* have been added to some of the names in the *Index nominum*.

The second edition of the *Invectivae* gives evidence of more extensive revision. The text itself contains ten new readings, listed in the *Praefatio* (p. iii). I found three misprints: at p. 2, line 1, for *ist* read *est*; at 10, 7, insert *et* before *res*; at 11, 16, read *scribentem* for *scribentum*.

The critical notes have been altered at a number of points, though it is not always clear whether the changes are genuine corrections or inadvertent errors. For example, the note to page 3, line 4, now reads "habites H<sup>b</sup>," whereas the corresponding entry in the first edition was "habitas H<sup>b</sup> habites H<sup>m</sup>." The note to 2, 12 now reads "minime non H<sup>b</sup>," in place of "minime] non H<sup>b</sup>." The note to 13, 19 reads "perpetuo om. B" in place of "perpetuo B." The note to 10, 7 reads "de nobis (H<sup>b</sup>) B Jo." in place of "de nobis (H<sup>b</sup>) E Jo." In the note to 9, 19, the entry "in HH<sup>b</sup>" must be a mistake for "id HH<sup>b</sup>." In the quotation from Cic. *Phil.* 2. 47, given as a parallel to page 5, lines 4ff., Kurfess has obscured his own point by printing "honesta" for "honeste." In the following line for "si quae" read "si qua." At three points (notes to 2, 3; 13, 4; 16, 12) manuscript P has been added to the list of manuscripts cited.

The *Praefatio* has been shortened by the elimination of the description of the manuscripts and the omission of the bibliography. Kurfess states (p. iv) that he accepts Seel's arguments against the authenticity of the first invective. He thus abandons his earlier view, expressed in various articles, that the invective is genuine, and returns to the position he took in his dissertation.

The *Conspectus locorum* (page 22 of the first edition) has been omitted, the *Index nominum* has been revised and augmented by the inclusion of references to *RE*, and

a list of words entitled *Voces prioris invectivae a sermone Sallustiano alienae* has been added. Kurfess states in the *Praefatio* that this list was taken from Seel.

PHILLIP DE LACY

Washington University

*Sybaris*. By JOSEPH SEVIER CALLAWAY. ("The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 37.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1950. Pp. x + 131. \$3.00.

It is unfortunate that Professor Callaway's study of Sybaris coincided rather awkwardly in its publication with T. J. Dunbabin's *The Western Greeks*. The latter is listed in Callaway's bibliography, but apparently could not be used in the preparation of the material. Callaway has not failed in the primary task of collecting the evidence and noticing the discussion in secondary treatments, but the historical significance of his subject gains so much as a part of the general study of the other Greek cities and native peoples of South Italy that the reader will turn to Dunbabin's few pages on Sybaris rather than to the chapter in Callaway's book. The other source of interest in Sybaris, however, the *Logoi*, retailed mainly by Athenaeus, has been developed in some detail. In the section on the natural resources and production of the region (pp. 22-40) it would have been worthwhile to distinguish more clearly between what is specifically attested for Sybaris such as wine, cattle, goats and sheep and what is perhaps general to the whole region; in part, its character, as reported in the Greek and Roman sources, may be the result of development in the Roman period.

CARL ROEBUCK

University of Chicago

*Le Déchiffrement des inscriptions minoennes*. By VLADIMIR GEORGIEV. (*Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté historico-*

*philologique*, Vol. XLV [1948-49], Part 4: *Linguistique et littérature*.) Sofia, 1949. Pp. 81.

*Inscriptions minoennes quasi-bilingues*. By VLADIMIR GEORGIEV. (*Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté historico-philologique*, Vol. XLVI [1949-50], Part 4: *Linguistique et littérature*.) Sofia, 1950. Pp. 85.

Despite the author's claim in these two successive articles that "la langue dite minoenne n'est plus une énigme: elle est déchiffrée définitivement," this "decipherment" is not at all a satisfactory solution to the problems of the Minoan scripts. Georgiev translates a very few Minoan inscriptions, and naturally enough finds possible, though generally improbable, meanings for them. He assigns phonetic values to a majority of the signs of the Linear B script, and to some of Linear A as well. He finds in the Minoan scripts an Indo-European. Prehellenic language of which some elements of vocabulary and structure may be traced in Greek, and he has established, largely on the basis of etymological inquiries unconnected with the inscriptions (cf., e.g., *Inscr. min. quasi-bil.*, pp. 38-57), the chief linguistic characteristics of that language. He also assumes the existence of several dialects of the language, Minoan (=Eteocretan?), Pelasgo-Philistine, Trojan-Etruscan, and others, and can describe some of the characteristics of each of these.

To account for the presence of this language in the Aegean area before Greek, and also to account for the absence of any non-Indo-European language (a point upon which he insists), Georgiev develops in his *Déchiffrement* (pp. 48-66) an outline of the movements of population from the Neolithic period through the Dorian Invasion. There are two important assumptions made in this survey of pre-history. The first is that the Neolithic population was Indo-European, since it must be responsible for such place names as end in *-nth* and *-ss*, which Georgiev holds to be Indo-European. The second is that the Greeks entered the Aegean no earlier than the

middle of the thirteenth century, and in no appreciable strength until after the Trojan War. Thus Hellas is hellenized and the Greek dialects are formed between the twelfth and seventh centuries. This theoretical reconstruction of ethnic movements in the Aegean depends little or not at all on the "decipherment." It has already appeared in Georgiev's earlier publications, and it has not been well received. The theory of the Indo-European character of the Prehellenic peoples has also failed of universal acceptance.

The "decipherment" itself depends in part on the assumptions that Georgiev knows the essential character of the language, that the Cypriote syllabary can indicate the sound values of signs of the Minoan scripts, and that Linear A and B are equivalent systems of writing. It has long ago been pointed out that these are dangerous assumptions. The methods the decipherer has followed and which he has carefully recorded in *Inscr. min. quasi-bil.* (pp. 29-37), along with the resulting equations of signs and values, are in themselves methods which will eventually be useful in deciphering Minoan (even with the hypothetical bilingual), but they are not here systematically applied, and too much of the evidence already available and well organized is neglected. The principal defect in the many "decipherments" which have been proposed has been that they all of necessity, and some of choice as well, are based upon an insufficient body of material. None of them will survive without essential modification the publication of the whole corpus of Minoan inscriptions.

EMMETT L. BENNETT, JR.

Yale University

*A History of Greek Literature*. By MOSES HADAS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950, Pp. viii + 327. \$4.25.

The two aims which Professor Hadas has set for himself, — "to mention every author down to the Hellenistic age whose remains are considerable enough to be



read (and not too many of whom there are no such remains) . . . nothing of permanent worth as literature written before the age of Justinian has been overlooked," and "to understand the Greeks . . . as thoughtful men who had and expressed an attitude toward their fellow men" — are necessarily impossible to achieve adequately in three hundred pages. The wonder is that he has done as well as he has. On first examination the book resembles most strongly the once highly popular German crambook of Kopp and Kohl, with its thumbnail summaries of content, its listings of lost works, and its relentless inclusion of third and fourth-rate authors of the post-classical period. This aspect of the work is doubtless useful in localities "where it will have no support from other works in its own field, and where it may therefore be consulted for a name or a date or a trustworthy interpretation," but for tabular information, the tabular form of a dictionary is better. A history of literature should primarily provide settings, trace relationships, and in general focus attention upon those aspects of Greek literature which are of particularly interest and value to a mid-twentieth century public.

Overburdened as he is by detail, Professor Hadas has, nevertheless, succeeded to a considerable degree in accomplishing this end, particularly in the first three fifths of the book (pp. 3-185) which deals with the classical period. Disputed points of interpretation are of course either ignored or tacitly settled according to currently conventional views, and conservatism is carried to the point where for example the author can declare that "there is no need to assume that the catalogue [of *Il.* 2] is a later 'Hesiodic' insertion," or can completely ignore the recent sociological interpretation of early tragedy. But on the other hand, the discussion of the authors most popular today, — Homer, the tragedians, Aristophanes, and Plato — is skilfully blended with an analysis of their works which selects, with the utmost compression, those details most characteristic of the author so as to leave an

accurate and clear-cut impression on the mind of the reader. The section on Aristophanes is probably the best among those on poetic authors, and that on Plato certainly the best among those on prose authors. It is significant that for these two, the author has allowed himself the most space — nine pages for Aristophanes and seventeen for Plato — and the excellent treatment there given makes one regret the sacrifice elsewhere of such manifest ability to the desire for *Vollständigkeit* in the latter part of the book.

The remaining seven chapters (pp. 186-298) are cast into rather loose categories: Chapter 12, Hellenistic Philosophy, Drama, History; Chapter 13, Alexandrian Literature and Learning; Chapter 14, Poetry to the End of Antiquity; Chapter 15, History, Travel, Criticism in the Roman Period; Chapter 16, Literature of Religion; Chapter 17, Orators and Encyclopedists of the Second Sophistic; Chapter 18, Lucian, the Novel. Here one cannot help admiring the ingenuity with which all Greek Christian literature is packed into five pages with a semblance of continuity, but one questions the usefulness of devoting two pages out of a scant 111 to Julian and only three each to Menander and Theocritus, even though the principle of more space to the lesser known authors is somewhat speciously invoked in the preface. However, the uninitiated reader will derive some acquaintance beyond the bare names with such men as Dion of Prusa, Philo Judaeus, the Philostrati, and Libanius in prose, and Oppian, Quintus Smyrnaeus, Nonnus, and the poets of the *Greek Anthology* in poetry, and will get a good elementary introduction to neo-Platonism and the Greek novel.

As a text book for the ever more popular courses in Greek literature in English, Professor Hadas' book will prove a safe guide whose facts are sound and whose interpretations are free from heresy. As a work of reference it must yield place for convenience to the new *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.

WARREN E. BLAKE

*University of Michigan*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

- BROD, MAX. *The Master*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 426. \$4.75.
- Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé. Third series, No. 3 (October, 1951). Paris: Association Guillaume Budé, 1951. Fr.125.
- BUTCHER, S. H. (ed. and trans.). *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, with a Critical Text and Translation of the Poetics*. With a Prefatory Essay *Aristotelian Literary Criticism* by JOHN GASSNER. 4th ed. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1951. Pp. lxxvi + 421. \$4.50.
- CLOCHÉ, PAUL. *La démocratie athénienne*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1951. Pp. 432. Fr. 900.
- CROSBY, H. LAMAR (trans.). *Dio Chrysostom, Vol. V: Discourses 61-80*. ("Loeb Classical Library," No. 385.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951. Pp. vi + 504 + 10. \$3.00.
- DIRINGER, DAVID. *The Alphabet: A Key to the History of Mankind*. 2d ed. rev. With a Foreword by SIR ELLIS MINNS. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 607. \$12.00.
- DRABKIN, MIRIAM F., and ISRAEL E. (eds.). *Caelius Aurelianus: Gynaecia: Fragments of a Latin Version of Soranus' Gynaecia from a Thirteenth Century Manuscript*. ("Supplements to the Bulletin of the History of Medicine," No. 13.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1951. Pp. xviii + 136. \$3.00.
- EDMONDS, J. M. (ed. and trans.). *The Samia of Menander: The Augmented Text with Notes and a Verse Translation*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., Ltd., 1951. Pp. 41.
- FINE, JOHN V. A. *Horoi: Studies in Mortgage, Real Security, and Land Tenure in Ancient Athens*. (*Hesperia*, Supplement IX.) Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1951. Pp. x + 216 + 7 pls. \$7.50.
- HAKAMIES, REINO. *Étude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutif latin et sa survie dans les langues romanes*. ("Annales Academiae scientiarum Fennicae," Ser. B, Tom. 71, 1.) Helsinki, 1951. Pp. 148. Mk. 400.
- Hermathena, No. LXXVIII (November, 1951). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3s.
- Historia, Vol. I, No. 3 (1950). Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1950. DM 40 a year (4 nos.).
- KELLING, LUCILE, and SUSKIN, ALBERT. *Index verborum Iuvenalis*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1951. Pp. vii + 139. \$5.00.
- KERÉNYI, C. *The Gods of the Greeks*. ("Myth and Man," ed. JOSEPH CAMPBELL.) London and New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc., 1951. Pp. 304 + 16 pls. + ills. in text. \$4.75.
- LACROIX, BENOÎT. *L'histoire dans l'antiquité*. With a Preface by H.-I. MARROU. Montréal: Institut d'Études médiévales, 1951. Pp. 252.
- LATTIMORE, RICHMOND (trans.). *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951. Pp. 527. \$4.50.
- LAVARENNE, M. (ed. and trans.). *Prudence*, Vol. IV: *Le livre des couronnes* (*Peristephanon liber*); *Dittochaon*; *Épilogue*. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les belles lettres," 1951. Pp. 232 + double pp.
- LEWIS, NAPHTALI, and REINHOLD, MEYER (eds.). *Roman Civilization: Selected Readings*. Edited with an Introduction and Notes. Vol. I: *The Republic*. ("Records of Civilization," No. XLV.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. Pp. xii + 544. \$5.00.
- LOPUSZANSKI, GEORGES. *La date de la capture de Valérien et la chronologie des empereurs gaulois*. ("Cahiers de l'Institut d'Études Polonaises en Belgique," No. 9.) Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Institut d'Études Polonaises en Belgique, 1951. Pp. vi + 79.
- MARTINAZZOLI, FOLCO. *La Successio di Marco*

- Aurelio: Struttura e spirito del primo libro dei Pensieri.* ("Mousikai Dialektoi," Supplementi, Ser. V, No. 1.) Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1951. Pp. 213.
- MORAU, PAUL. *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote.* With a Preface by AUGUSTIN MANSION. ("Aristote, traductions et études," Collection publiée par l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie de l'Université de Louvain.) Louvain: Éditions universitaires de Louvain, 1951. Pp. x + 391. Fr. 280; \$5.60.
- MÜLLER, GERHARD. *Studien zu den Platonischen Nomoi.* (Zetemata, Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 3.) München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1951. Pp. 194. DM 15.
- ONIAN, RICHARD BROXTON. *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate: New Interpretations of Greek, Roman and kindred evidence, also of some basic Jewish and Christian Beliefs.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1951. Pp. xviii + 547. \$9.00.
- OSWIECIMSKI, STEPHANUS. *Ad litteras romanas symbolae duae.* (Reprinted from *Eos: Commentarii Societatis philologiae Polonorum*, Vol. XLIV [1950], Fasc. 1, pp. 111-22, eds. VICTOR STEFFEN and LADISLAUS STRZELECKI.) Wratislaviae, 1951.
- . *De scriptorum romanorum vestigiis apud Tertullianum obvis quæstiones selectae.* ("Polska Akademia Umiejętności," Archiwum filologiczne, No. 24.) Kraków: Nakładem polskiej akademii umiejętności, 1951. Pp. 96.
- . *Thales: The Ancient Ideal of a Scientist.* (Reprinted from *Charisteria Thaddæo Sinko quinquaginta abhinc annos amplissimis in philosophia honoribus ornato ab amicis collegis discipulis oblata*, pp. 229-53.) Wratislaviae, 1951.
- PAGE, D. L. *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1951. Pp. 46. \$0.50.
- PLATNAUER, MAURICE. *Latin Elegiac Verse: A Study of the Metrical Usages of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1951. Pp. viii + 122. \$3.00.
- REESOR, MARGARET E. *The Political Theory of the Old and Middle Stoa.* New York: J. J. Augustin Publisher, 1951. Pp. x + 60.
- ROBINS, R. H. *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe, with Particular Reference to Modern Linguistic Doctrine.* London: G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1951. Pp. viii + 104. 8s.6d.
- RUNNER, HOWARD EVAN. *The Development of Aristotle Illustrated from the Earliest Books of the Physics.* (Dissertation, Amsterdam, 1951.) Amsterdam: J. H. Kok N.V. Kampen, 1951. Pp. 160.
- SCHÖBER, ARNOLD. *Die Kunst von Pergamon.* Wien: Margarete Friedrich Rohrer Verlag, 1951. Pp. 202 + 161 pls. \$7.50.
- SIDGWICK, A. *Introduction to Greek Prose Composition, with Exercises.* New Edition, with enlarged Vocabulary by J. F. MOUNTFORD. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., 1951. Pp. xvi + 294. \$2.50.
- SPRINGHETTI, AEMILIUS, S. J. *Latinitas perennis, Vol. I: Selecta latinitatis scripta auctorum recentium* (Saec. XV-XX). ("Schola Superior Litterarum Latinarum in Pontificia Universitate Gregoriana.") Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1951. Pp. xii + 775.
- TABACHOVITZ, DAVID. *Homerische el-Sätze: Eine sprachpsychologische Studie.* ("Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen," No. III.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1951. Pp. 156. Kr. 20.
- THOMSON, J. A. K. *Classical Influences on English Poetry.* London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.; New York: Macmillan Co., 1951. Pp. 271. \$3.50.
- WILKINS, ERNEST HATCH. *The Making of the Canzoniere and Other Petrarchan Studies.* Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1951. Pp. xxviii + 423 + 2 tables + 3 pls. L. 3700.
- WILLIAMS, HARRY F. (compiler). *An Index of Mediaeval Studies Published in Festschriften, 1865-1946, with Special Reference to Romanic Material.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951. Pp. x + 165. \$4.00.
- ZGUSTA, LADISLAV. *Sur quelques gloses cypriotes.* ("Věstník královské české společnosti nauk," Třída filosoficko-historicko-filologická, Ročník 1950, Číslo 1.) Prague: Nakladem královské české společnosti nauk, 1951. Pp. 11.

ork:  
+60.  
ram-  
cular  
trine.  
Pp.

ment  
rliest  
Am-  
Kok

mon.  
erlag,

Prose  
ition,  
UNT-  
a and

.  
initas  
cripta  
).  
arum  
una.")  
riana,

Sätze:  
Skrif-  
hen,"  
1951.

ces on  
llen &  
a Co.,

of the  
udies.  
atura,  
+ 3

Index  
Fest-  
Refer-  
y and  
fornia

cypri-  
ēnosti  
filolo-  
rague:  
ēnosti